A BOUNDARY TO THE HOLY MOUNT,

OR,

A BARRE against Free Admission to the LORDS SUPPER.

In Answer

To an humble Vindication of free Admission to the LORDS SUPPER.

Published by Mr. *Humphrey* Minister of *Froome* in *Somersetshire*.

Which humble Vindication, though it profess much of piety and conscience, yet upon due triall and examination, is found worthy of Suspension, if not of a greater Censure.

By *Roger Drake* Minister of *Peters Cheap London*.

He set the Porters at the gates of the House of the Lord, that none which was unclean in any thing should enter in. 2 Chron. 23. 19.

London, printed by *Abraham Miller*, 1653.

THE PREFACE To the READER.

IT's one of the Devil's prime Engines to pervert Divine Ordinances quite contrary to their primitive inſtitution: ſo he did in Paradiſe, ſo he did in the Jewiſh Church, and ſo he hath done a long time, and ſtill doth in the Chriſtian Church. No wonder then if he turn the choiceſt myſtery of peace into a Sacrament of war, a feaſt of love into a bone of contention. This he did by diſorder in the primitive Church, 1 Cor. 11. *by Tranſubſtantiation in the Apoſtacy of the Church, by Conſubſtantiation in the Reſtitution of the Church; and now by a ſpirit of oppoſition againſt Sacramentall triall in the Reformation of the Church.*

In the managing of this unhappy Contro-

verſie, *Mr.*Humphrey *hath appeared three times in the field in his threefold Edition, pleading free admiſſion to the Lords Supper for all but three ſorts, againſt whom himſelf is pleaſed to ſhut the Chancell door, though the worſt of thoſe three kindes is better many times then ſundry of thoſe for whom he opens the door. Should we take the boldneſs to ask him, by what authority he excludes any from the Sacrament (it being in his profeſt judgement a converting Ordinance) or by what rule of Scripture and charity he walks, in excluding the worſt from the means of converſion, who need it more then the beſt, it would puzzle him more (and that upon good ground) then that captious Quære of the Phariſees did our Saviour,* Matth.21.23. *But whether the Lords Supper be a converting Ordinance or not, Mr.*H. *muſt needs be at a great loſs, for if it convert not, then why ſhould they receive it who are viſibly unconverted? If it do convert (as well as the Word preached) then why ſhould any at all be excluded from it?*

When this Anſwer was almoſt ready for the Preſs, out comes his third Edition, ſomewhat auctior, *but I dare not ſay* correctior. *This put me upon a review, and confirmed me in my opinion, that his Doctrine of free admiſſion*

admiſſion is but meer Church-levelling, and will in a ſhort time make this glorious Church like the field of the Sluggard, Prov. 24.30,31. *When I ſeriouſly weigh his looſe Principles held forth to the world in this Treatiſe, with his being ſo exceſſively favourable to the looſer and profaner ſort, it makes both my ſelf and others apt to ſuſpect, his practiſes may poſſibly be as looſe as his principles. Looſe principles and practiſes, like* Eſau *and* Jacob, Pharez *and* Zarah, *taking each other by the heel, and ſtriving who ſhall come out firſt. Twins they are, and its hard to ſay which is the Elder brother.*

My ſcope in this Anſwer is (if God ſhall adde his bleſſing) 1. *To convince Mr.* H. *and others ſeduced by him, how contrary his Doctrine is to Scripture, reaſon, and his own profeſt principles.* 2. *To prevent the further ſpreading of this leaven, which will ſowre the whole lump, and make Reformation (ſo much longed for, hoped for, and laboured for by the godly) to be utterly deſperate. Withall I muſt tell him, that this fancy of his (quite contrary to the judgement and practice of the reformed Churches, of the Church of* England *even in the daies of the Prelates, to the expreſs letter of the Book of Common Prayer, to the declared*

*judgement of the reverend Assembly, and to the Votes of Parliament unrepealed) hath exceedingly grieved the hearts of the godly, rejoyced and gladded the hearts of the wicked, and hath done more mischief already, then ten Mr.*Humphreys *are ever like to do good. The Lord give him a sight of his errour, and grace to burn this hay and stubble, before the day of the Lord come to try it, and himself for it,* 1 Cor. 3. 13.

One scruple yet untouched, which may haply stumble the Reader, I must not passe. What if a person by the previous exhortation, (wherein the death of Christ is both audibly and visibly set forth) be really converted, may he not then actually partake of the Elements, and be admitted to receive by and with the Church? Answ. 1. *A person at first conversion sees himself so loathsome and unworthy, that he shall not need a bridle from, but rather a spur to the Sacrament.* 2. *Its not enough for a person to be really clean, but he must also be judicially clean before he be admitted to communion,* Levit. 14. 1, 31. *whenever Christ cleansed any, he still sent them to the Priest to pronounce them clean,* Levit. 17. 14. 3. *However a man be really, the Church must proceed by the rule of visibility, and cannot admit any till he be visibly converted.*

This

This is a doctrine cannot well down with ignorant and prophane perſons; it will be a ſtumbling block to the Iew, and fooliſhneſſe to the Greek; from whom I can expect no better entertainment then farre my betters have been content with before me.

I ſhall cloſe with thoſe golden though rowſing expreſſions of the Provinciall Aſſembly, in that excellent Piece of theirs, The Vindication of the Presbyteriall Government, *publiſhed* Nov. 2. 1649. pag. 74. *which book had Mr.* H. *ſeriouſly peruſed, it might (through Gods bleſſing) have darted ſuch a beam of Majeſty into his conſcience, as would have quenched this* Ignis fatuus *of his, before it had miſled ſo many into bogs and quagmires. Their words are theſe:* We are not ignorant that the Presbyterian Government *(eſpecially as applied in order to Sacramentall triall)* hath many Adverſaries. The obſtinately ignorant hates it, becauſe it will not ſuffer him to go blindfold to hell. The profane perſon hates it, becauſe it will not ſuffer him to eat and drink his own damnation by unworthy coming to the Sacrament. The Heretick hates it, becauſe after two or three admonitions it rejects him. The Jeſuite hates it, becauſe it is an invincible Bulwark to keep

keep out Popery. The Schismatick hates it, because the main design of it is to make all the Saints to be of one lip, one heart, and one way. And above all the Devil hates it, because if rightly managed, it will in a short time blow up his kingdome. *Reader, let me but crave the favour Mr.* H. *his Prefacer doth, that thou reade both this Answer and his Book* with an impartiall and disingaged judgement, perusing both with a single eye, *and I am confident thou wilt neither be of Mr.* H. *his judgement nor practice, a stickler for breaking of Bounds, or removing the Land-mark set first by God himself, and afterwards by the Elders of our* Israel. *I leave it to thy serious perusall, and both thee and it to Gods blessing, and remain,*

Thine in the Lord Jesus,

From my Study in
Philip Lane,
Feb. 2. 165$\frac{2}{3}$.

ROGER DRAKE.

Reader, I am desired to give thee notice, That there is now published an Answer to Mr *John Goodwins* Book entituled *Redemption Redeemed,* by Mr *Kendall* sometimes Fellow of *Exeter* Colledge: with an Attestation by the Vice-Chancellor and publike Professors of Divinity in *Oxford.*

A Barre to free Admiſſion to the Sacrament.

SO winning a grace is Humility, that the very appearance of it will credit an Errour, *Col.* 3. 18. where Truth it ſelf uſherd in by pride and paſſion, loſes much of its luſtre and acceptance. But where Humility leads the Van, and Satisfaction of tender Conſciences brings up the Rear, who almoſt dares face ſuch an Army, or queſtion a Cauſe ſo maintained, as heterodox and unſound? No wonder Maſter *Humphreys Free Admiſſion* findes ſo free and generall acceptance, eſpecially with perſons already inclinable to his opinion; when the Title page is more potent to charm, then the whole Book is to convince the Reader.

An humble Vindication of a free Admiſſion

miſſion unto the Lords Supper. Publiſhed for the eaſe, ſupport, and ſatisfaction of tender conſciences, &c.

So gracious a Porch cannot but promiſe a glorious Edifice, and by bribing the affections may ſoon corrupt the judgement of a weak and unſetled Chriſtian. If Mr. *Humphrey* be the man this Title ſpeaks him, I hope he will as freely admit me to write as he will admit others to receive; nor can a free debate be queſtioned, where a free admiſſion is maintained. And if I may be free, I muſt ingenuouſly profeſs, I cannot but ſtumble at the very threſhold, eſpecially when I compare it with ſome parts of the Building. In the Title I ſee a profeſſion of humility, in the Book I reade many expreſſions that ſavour ſtrongly of pride. Further, that a plea for free admiſſion ſhould eaſe and ſatisfie tender conſciences, which both hath been, and is the trouble of tender conſciences (unleſs it be very clearly and ſtrongly made out) is to me a paradox both in reaſon and Divinity. Waving therefore the judging of perſons (for who am I that I ſhould judge my brother) I ſhall preſent to the Reader ſome of M. *Humphreys* expreſſions,

expreſſions, and let the world judge whether they ſavour more of pride or of humility.

When Chriſt offers himſelf, and grace, which are the things ſignified, to poor ſinners, how can we have the conſcience to turn them away from the ſignes and means thereof in this Ordinance? Pag. 11.

To wave at preſent the weakneſs of his Argument (which hath more rhetorick then logick) is not this a ſad aſperſion of unconſcionableneſs upon thoſe honourable, reverend, and pious perſons, who after ſo long and ſerious debate, have both voted and executed the Ordinance for ſuſpenſion, &c. *Anſw.*

Is Chriſt offered as a free gift in the Word, and muſt we not come without our price and money to this Ordinance? Why this is even as they conceive of Judas, *who being about to ſell our Saviour, went out to make his bargain at the Supper.* Pag. 16.

What other conſtruction will theſe words bear, but that the friends of Suſpenſion with *Simon Magus* think grace is vendible, and with *Judas* are about to make a bargain of Chriſt at the Supper?

Having urged the inſtance of *Judas*

as a ground of free admiſſion, he concludes in theſe words; *And what more need be urged, but that men when they are willing not to ſee, will let any hand put over their eyes be enough to blinde them?* It ſeems the Patrons of Suſpenſion are willingly ignorant, &c. a charge laid by the Apoſtle upon profane ſcoffers, 2 *Pet.* 3. 3,5. and by Mr. *Humphrey* upon pious Reformers.

Again, *page* 22. he makes *the ſelecting of people to this Ordinance, a vanity, formality, and impoſsibility.* An heavy Cenſure, though weakly made out, as ſhall (God willing) appear in the enſuing diſcourſe.

Severall other harſh paſſages I might inſert, but theſe forementioned may ſuffice to convince the Reader, that Maſter *Humphrey* in ſuffering both his tongue and pen ſo to out-laſh, ſinned himſelf very much againſt the law of charity and humility. But enough of this unpleaſant ſubject. Let us proceed to the Diſcourſe it ſelf, and weigh his Arguments in the balance of the Sanctuary and of ſound reaſon.

His ſubject is free admiſſion. *His ground is* Matth. 26. 27. *compared with* Mark

Mark 14.23. *from precept and example. All the Apoſtles were bid to receive, all of them did receive, and amongſt the reſt* Judas, *though really and viſibly unworthy.* Ergo,

Becauſe Mr. *Humphrey* is ſo confident upon *Judas* his receiving the Lords Supper; namely, 1. That he did receive it. 2. That his receiving is a ſolid ground for free admiſſion; I ſhall therefore firſt produce thoſe reaſons which ſeeme weighty to me, and have moved ſundry godly and learned, both ancient and modern, to be of a contrary opinion; and ſecondly, Shall endeavour to make good, that ſuppoſing *Judas* did actually receive, it makes nothing for Mr. *Humphreys* free admiſſion. *Anſw.*

And 1. That *Judas* received not the Lords Supper, theſe Arguments ſeem convincing.

1. Chriſt knew him to be an hypocrite, a reprobate, and a devil, and ſo utterly uncapable of any good by the Sacrament.

2. Chriſts bloodwas ſhed for the remiſſion of their ſins who received the Lords Supper, compare *Mat.* 26.28. and *Luke* 22.20. It was not ſhed for the remiſſion of *Judas* his ſins; *Ergo, Judas* did not

receive the Lords Supper.

3. Chriſt promiſed to drink wine in his Fathers Kingdome with thoſe who received the Lords Supper; He did not promiſe to drink wine with *Judas* in his Fathers Kingdome; *Ergo*, *Judas* did not receive the Lords Supper. See *Matth.* 26. 29.

4. *Judas* went out immediately after the Sop, *John* 13. 30. This Sop was given him before the Sacrament; *Ergo*, he was not at the Sacrament. Yea, from *John* 13. 1. ſome are of the minde, that *Judas* did not partake ſo much as of the Paſſeover, but onely of the common Supper which immediately forewent the Paſſeover. See *Aarons Rod bloſſoming. lib.* 3. *cap.* 9.

5. All Chriſts gracious and comfortable expreſſions to his Apoſtles, were allayed with exceptions while *Judas* was preſent, not ſo at and after the Lords Supper; *Ergo*, *Iudas* was not then preſent. Compare *Iohn* 6. 70. & 13. *ver.* 10. 18. 21. with *Matth.* 26. 29. *Luke* 22. *ver.* 28, 29, 30. He that excepted *Iudas* in the former expreſſions, would much more have excepted him in the latter, had he then been preſent. Theſe and the like grounds

grounds, have moved ſundry both ancient and modern Writers to beleeve that *Iudas* did not receive the Lords Supper; namely, *Clemens*, *Dionyſius Areopagita*, *Hilarius*, *Maximus*, *Pachymeres*, *Ammonius Alexandrinus*, *Tatianus*, *Innocentius* 3. *Theophylactus*, *Rupertus Tuitienſis*, & *Victor Antiochenus*, Among the Schoolmen, *Salmeron*, *Turrianus*, *Durandus*, *Barradius*, And of Proteſtants, *Daneus*, *Kleinwitzius*, *Piſcator*, *Beza*, *Toſſanus*, *Muſculus*, *Zanchius*, *Gomarus*, *Diodati*, *Grotius*, &c. See *Aarons Rod bloſſoming*, l. 3. c. 8.

Mr. *H.* his foundation from *Mark* 14.23. (which as his Text is the ground, though miſ-interpreted and miſ-applyed, of that his unhappy Diſcourſe) will ſtand him in little ſtead. The Text ſaies, *They all drank of it.* Thence Mr. *Humphrey* concludes, ergo, *Iudas received the Sacrament.*

1. Underſtand it of all that were preſent, but its eaſier ſaid then proved, that *Iudas* was preſent at the Lords Supper. *Anſw.*

2. *All*, in Scripture, is ſometimes put for *the moſt part*, eſpecially in order to the number of the Apoſtles, 1 *Cor.* 15.7. yea *ver.* 5. of the ſame Chapter, *twelve*

is put for *eleven* by roundneſs of number. Its then a meer *non ſequitur* to argue from all the Apoſtles drinking to *Judas* his drinking, or from the Twelves drinking to *Judas* his drinking, ſince 1. *All* may very well be underſtood of all preſent. 2. Becauſe *all* in Scripture-phraſe is put to ſignifie *the moſt part*, and *twelve* in Scripture-expreſſion is put for *eleven*.

Object. But doth not our bleſſed Saviour immediately after the delivery of the Bread and Wine ſay, *But behold the hand of him that betrayeth me is with me on the Table*, Luke 22. ver. 21. and if ſo, was not *Judas* then preſent at the Lords Supper; and if all preſent received, muſt not *Judas* needs receive alſo?

Anſw. 1. I might ſay, the conſequence is weak, to argue from preſence to receiving. But that I ſhall not urge now, becauſe of my former conceſſion.

2. Its evident, that *Luke* writes *per ὑστερολογίαν*, not ſo much obſerving the order of time, as the ſubſtance of the matter; which as its frequent in Scripture, ſo particularly the Harmony of the Evangeliſts evinceth it in this ſubject; we having two Evangeliſts for one, to prove that thoſe words (*Behold, the hand of him that*

that betrayeth me, &c.) were ſpoken before, not after the Inſtitution of the Lords Supper, and one of theſe Evangeliſts was preſent and received the Lords Supper, ſo was not *Luke*, who ſtood not ſo much upon the order, as upon the truth of the Narrative in this buſineſs of the Supper. See *Matth.26.ver.*21,24,26. *Mark* 14. *ver.*18,21,22. It follows not then, that becauſe *Judas* was at the Table, ſhared in the common Supper, yea haply in the Paſſover, that therefore he received the Lords Supper, or was preſent at it.

But ſuppoſe he was preſent & received.

1. The Apoſtles ſcarce ſuſpected him, though diſcovered, *John* 13 28,29.

2. *Judas* had not yet actually betrayed Chriſt, his treaſon as well as *Peters* deniall was yet future; and its abſurd to puniſh any for a future ſin.

3. Chriſt acting here as a Miniſter, it was not fit he ſhould be both Judge and Witneſs, and it might have been an ill preſident for Miniſters to take upon them by their own power to deny the Sacrament judicially to whom they pleaſe. Its farre otherwiſe with us, ſeeing none are ſuſpended, but 1. Such as

ſuſpend

ſuſpend themſelves by ſlighting or refuſing due triall. 2. Such as upon triall are found unworthy through ignorance or ſcandall, and that onely till they gain better information, or give the Church juſt ſatisfaction. By all which it appears how weak Mr. *Humphreys* firſt foundation is, and that therefore the ſuperſtructure cannot be ſtrong. *Contrà* from his own proof we argue againſt him thus: None of the Apoſtles were either ignorant or ſcandalous, no not *Judas* himſelf, *ergo*, his or their receiving is no warrant for any ignorant or ſcandalous perſon to receive. The main queſtion is about *Judas*, and not as to ignorance, but ſcandall. And ſcandall cannot ariſe, but 1. From a ſin committed by a profeſſor. 2. Known and divulged. But *Judas* had not yet betrayed Chriſt, no more then *Peter* had denied him; *ergo*, he was not yet convicted of a ſcandalous ſin. You will ſay *Judas* had already done it in purpoſe and compact. *Anſw.* True, yet Chriſt charges him not with that, but onely foretels his actuall treachery, which being not yet perpetrated, was no viſible bar to his preſent receiving, but a ſad effect of his unworthy receiving

(ſup-

(ſuppoſing he did receive) the devil entring into him as well after the Sacrament as after the Sop, *Iohn* 13.27. Let all ignorant and ſcandalous perſons take heed of *Iudas* his ſin (unworthy receiving) leſt the fate of *Iudas* betide them; namely, 1. Spirituall poſſeſſion by Satan. 2. Chriſt-murther. 3. Self-murder.

State the caſe aright, and a mean capacity may eaſily apprehend how wide and wilde Mr. *Humphrey* his concluſion is. *Iudas* a great profeſſor, and an eminent and extraordinary Miniſter, plots and purpoſes a great ſin; that he ſhall commit this ſin, is foretold by a ſpirit of revelation, as alſo was *Peters* deniall and perjury. The queſtion is, Whether either or both of them ſhall be ſuſpended the Sacrament. For my part, I think neither: 1. Becauſe thoſe ſins were not yet committed, and ſo not ſcandalous. 2. Becauſe Chriſt acting as a Miniſter could not be both witneſs, judge, and executioner. If you ſay he acted as God or as Mediator. *Anſw.* Its very dangerous to make Chriſts Divine or Mediatory acts a preſident for imitation. Who will ſay, the Magiſtrate ſhould not condemn the adultreſs

adultreſs, becauſe Chriſt did not condemn her? *Iohn* 8.10,11. Chriſt adminiſtred the Sacrament onely to men, onely to Miniſters, after ſupper, in an upper room, muſt we therefore do no otherwiſe? Whenever Mr. *Humphrey* preaches again upon this ſubject, let me intreat him to take a more pertinent Text, if at leaſt he can finde it; otherwiſe I muſt tell him, he will ſcarce prove himſelf (what he is ſtiled) a Maſter of Arts.

But to paſs on. For the better managing of his cauſe, *pag.* 3. Mr. *Humphrey* premiſeth, *That in the Church God hath ſet up his Ordinances of the Word and Sacrament. Of theſe Ordinances ſome are capable, and ſome uncapable. Thoſe that are uncapable, are either ſo by nature, as infants and diſtracted perſons, or by the Churches Cenſure of Excommunication, and none others.*

Before we proceed, lets ſee what water ſome of theſe dictates will hold. And 1. How can he prove that Infants and diſtracted perſons are uncapable of the Sacrament by nature, eſpecially upon his own principles: for now I ſhall diſpute partly *ad hominem* and partly *ad rem*, and I doubt not but the judicious

Reader

Reader will eaſily reach me in both. I ſhall 1. inſtance in the word. Why are Infants and *(pari ratione)* diſtracted perſons uncapable of the Word? or where hath God ſaid they ſhould be kept from it, unleſs by their crying or unſeemly geſtures they prove troubleſome to the Congregation? I can ſhew him the contrary, where God would have them preſent at the Word and Ordinances. Let him conſult *Deut.* 29. 11, 12. & 31. 12. *Joſh.* 8. 35. *Joel* 2. 16. & 2 *Chron.* 20. 13. and that to enter into Covenant, &c. as is evident in ſome of the places quoted, eſpecially the two firſt. If God bids them come, why ſhould Maſter *Humphrey* ſay they are uncapable? 2. Suppoſe them uncapable, yet who knows how God may work at the Word, though not by the Word? May not that Word be an occaſion of converſion to Infants, which is an inſtrument of converſion to elder perſons?

Infants indeed may be uncapable in an active, but not in a paſſive ſenſe; as to apprehenſion and underſtanding, not as to Divine Impreſſions. God can work upon perſons at or by his Ordinances, occaſionally or inſtrumentally, when he

is

is honoured by their active or paſſive preſentation before him, which may be the caſe of blinde and deaf perſons, as well as of Infants and innocents, and upon which account (as well as out of a deſire to honour God) ſome pious perſons have thought it their duty to attend upon the publick Miniſtry, though they were deaf. Why ſhould not I believe that Chriſt is willing to ſpeak immediately to him that loves to be where Chriſt ſpeaks mediately? If men can ſpeak by ſignes as well as words, ſure Chriſt can much more ſpeak by his Spirit to ſuch deaf perſons. If ſome in hearing do not hear, *Iſa.6.9,10.* why may not others hear in not hearing? An hearing heart is better then an hearing ear. More might be added, but I muſt contract.

Next, for the Lords Supper. Suppoſing that Mr. *Humphrey* is for Pædobaptiſme. I ask him in the next place, Why are Infants capable of Baptiſme, and not of the Lords Supper? If he ſay, Becauſe they cannot examine themſelves, nor diſcern the Lords Body, &c. Then I anſwer, No more can groſly ignorant perſons; who therefore (*pari ratione*) upon Mr. *Humphrey* his principles, and according

according to truth, muſt be kept away: but that they cannot be unleſs diſcerned, nor can they be diſcerned unleſs tried; and who have more authority to try them, then ſuch as are over them in the Lord, and delegated for that purpoſe both by God and man?

Further, that perſons excommunicated are uncapable of the Word preached. How proves he that? Upon this account I dare challenge him and all the world for one proof of Scripture, either direct or by conſequence. An excommunicate perſon is but as an heathen, *Matth.* 18. 17. and heathens might be admitted to hear, why then not excommunicated perſons, they needing that effectuall means of converſion as much or more then Heathens.

Laſtly, Whereas in the cloſe he adds, *That none others are uncapable*; and ſo by conſequence none others ought to be kept away, What thinks he 1. of perſons infected with the plague, &c. 2. What thinks he of perſons ſtark ſtaring drunk, or that with *Zimry* and *Coſby* ſhall commit actuall uncleanneſs in the face of the Congregation, and the like? will Mr. *Humphrey* proſtitute the Sacrament

to

to the luſts of ſuch bruits and ſwine? For ſhame then let him not plead that all muſt be admitted but infants, mad men, and excommunicated perſons.

In the ſame page, I wonder Mr. *H.* is ſo diffident where he may be confident. His words are theſe, *I dare not yet poſitively ſay, for the peoples part, that all are ſo capable that they may come as they liſt.* For my own part, I aſſent to it as an undoubted truth, that none are ſo capable that they may come as they liſt. How doth this man ſtrain at a gnat, and ſwallow a Camel; ſtumble at a ſtraw, and leap over a block? doubts an evident truth, and pleads ſtrongly for a looſe and undoubted errour, that all may be admitted pell mell. How juſt is it with God, that he who is confident where he ſhould be diffident, ſhould alſo be diffident where he ought to be confident?

Page 4. He aſſerts, *Such an univerſall capacity for all men indefinitely, that if any come in as profeſſing themſelves ready to enter into covenant with Chriſt, deſiring to ſerve him in the worſhip of this Ordinance (the former onely excepted) the Miniſter and Church ought to admit him,* &c.

From this Conceſſion let me be bold

to

to ask Mr.*Humphrey* before whom ſhall they make this profeſſion? If before the Miniſter and the Church (as he ſeems to hint) then may not the Miniſter before the Church deſire ſome evidence of the ſincerity of this their profeſſion? If not, then let Mr. *H.* ſhew where he is forbid to make this ſcrutiny. If he may, then undoubtedly he may try that profeſſor as to his knowledge and grace; and do we deſire any more? nay not ſo much. Let Mr. *H.* perſwade the people but to make this profeſſion before the Elderſhip (we deſire not to put their modeſty to it before the Congregation) and we ſhall either admit them at preſent, or undertake to fit them (by Gods grace) for the Sacrament, before we have done with them, if at leaſt they will but ſubmit to be ruled by us.

If he mean, that the Miniſter muſt reſt in that verball profeſſion, without any further ſcrutiny, then why may not a childe of three yeers old, or a mad man be admitted, ſince they may eaſily be taught the words of that profeſſion? Further, doth Mr.*Humphrey* admit none but ſuch as make this profeſſion? Here I appeal to his own conſcience, and to his Congregation.

If yet he fly from a verball to a virtuall profeſſion, and think their very coming or ſending their names to their Miniſter over night, &c. be ſufficient, eſpecially if he take this courſe with ſtrangers alſo, then how doth he know whether they be Chriſtians or heathen, ſober or diſtracted, children or elder perſons, excommunicated or members of the Church. So that turn which way he pleaſe, he will finde himſelf in a nooſe of his own making.

Page 4. & 5. Lets now proceed to his proof from analogy of the Paſſover, to which he ſaies there was a free admiſſion.

Anſw. 1. Its well he corrects himſelf from *Numb.* 9. whereby it appears there was not a free admiſſion to the Paſſeover, and then where is his argument? If he plead, that onely legall uncleanneſs excluded them, I ask him why? He will anſwer, becauſe it defiled the Congregation, or the Ordinances and holy things, or both. Content But what if it be proved that not onely Leviticall, but alſo morall uncleanneſs defiled the holy things, and that therefore ſuch perſons alſo were to be kept away. For proof hereof, compare *Levit.* 18.24,25. Morall pollutions

defiled

defiled firſt the perſon, and then the Land, *Levit.* 16.16. They defiled the Sanctuary, *Ezek.* 23. *verſe* 37,39. Adulterers and Murderers, and Idolaters, coming reaking out of their ſins into Gods Houſe, defiled the Sanctuary thereby, *Hag.* 2.14. For neglecting to build Gods Temple; themſelves, their actions and their Sacrifices were unclean; and though the Temple were typicall and ceremoniall, yet their neglecting to build it at Gods command, was a direct breach of the ſecond Commandment, and therefore a ſin, or morall pollution. And that all unclean perſons were to be ſuſpended, is evident by 2 Chron. 23.19. *Where Iehojadah is commended for ſetting porters at the gates of the Houſe of the Lord, that none which were unclean in any thing ſhould enter in.* The Lord ſend us many ſuch *Iehojada's*. Where then were Mr. *H.* his eyes, who aſſerts ſo confidently page 5. *But as for any ſpirituall pollution whatſoever, we reade of none that might debar them from that Ordinance.* Did he not reade, or did he not minde, or did he not underſtand, or did he not remember any of the foremention ed places? for I will not be ſo uncharitable as to conclude he

never read over the old Teſtament, or that againſt his conſcience he delivered the forementioned words, or that he quibbled and equivocated upon the preſent Tenſe for the preter Tenſe.

Beſides, the inſtance of *Hezekiahs* Paſſover, ſhews that morall uncleanneſs made them more unworthy of the Paſſover then Leviticall uncleanneſs; the Lord then accepting the upright heart, *though not cleanſed according to the purification of the Sanctuary*, 2 *Chr.*30.18,19,20.

2. If Mr. *Humphrey* ground upon this inſtance of the Paſſover, then not onely elder perſons, but alſo Infants muſt partake of the Lords Supper, for Infants were admitted to the Paſſover, ſince all circumciſed perſons were to eat thereof; and if ſo, then where is his firſt diſtinction that makes Infants uncapable.

3. Whereas *pag.* 5. he makes the ſecluding of unclean perſons a type of our excommunication. He muſt excuſe me if I believe not his bare dictates without proof. I thought legall types had reſpected Evangelicall graces, or ſpirituall uncleanneſſes, but not Evangelicall Ordinances, unleſs Chriſt, the onely great and effectuall Ordinance. Further, had they

they not the Ordinance of Excommunication amongſt them as well as we, and why ſhould that be typified which was viſibly preſent? And here by the way let me ask Maſter *Humphrey*, whether amongſt the *Jews* an excommunicated perſon might have been admitted to the Paſſover? That they had Excommunication is evident *John* 9.22,34. & 12.42. & *Matth.*18.17. and that by the rules of the *Jews* ſuch were neither to be eat nor drunk with. Further, that Excommunication was not for Leviticall pollutions, but ſcandalous ſins; and in particular, that not onely Leviticall pollutions, but alſo ſcandalous ſins were a barre to the receiving of the Paſſeover. Contrary to Mr. *H.* his Aſſertion above mentioned.

For clearing whereof conſider, that there were 3 degrees of Excommunication amongſt the Jews: A perſon excommunicated in the firſt degree, was called *Niddui*, ſeparated or caſt out of the Synagogue, *Ioh.*9.22. The ſecond, *Cherem*, or delivered up to Satan, 1 *Corinth.*5.5. 1 *Tim.*1.20. The third, *Schammatha*, or *Maranatha*, 1 Cor.16.22.

In the Greek Church there were four degrees of Excommunication. 1. Σύναξις,

ſuch were onely barred the Lords Table. 2. ὑποστωσις, ſuch might hear onely behinde the Pulpit, and muſt depart with the *Catechumeni*, &c. 3. ἀκροασις, ſuch might come no further then the Church porch, and might not joyn in Prayer, &c. 4, περιλαυσις, ſuch ſtood quite without the Church, requeſting others with tears to pray for them, and thence they were called *plorantes*.

By all which it appears, 1. That Suſpenſion is no new invention, but if juridically iſſued forth, was a degree of excommunication; which being in Mr. *H.* his judgement a barre to the Lords Supper, he muſt needs grant Suſpenſion to be a barre to receiving, unleſs he will contradict both the truth and himſelf. 2. Its evident, that Excommunication is not a barre to preſence at all Ordinances, ſince all the four degrees of excommunicated perſons amongſt the Greeks might partake of ſome Ordinances, at leaſt without the Church. And *Niddui* amongſt the Jews *might be preſent at Divine Service, to teach others, and learn of others, though he might not come neer any the diſtance of four cubits*, &c. 3. Its evident, that Excommunication was not

for

for Leviticall but morall pollutions (at leaſt in the apprehenſion of thoſe who excommunicated) 1. By Scripture, *Mat.* 18.15,17. where obſtinacy in ſin is made a juſt ground of excommunication, *If thy brother treſpaſs againſt thee*, &c. *John* 9. *ver.*22,34. & 12.42. they looked at the confeſſion of Jeſus as Chriſt, as a ſin that deſerved excommunication; which though a groſs and dangerous miſtake, yet evinceth that morall pollution was with them the ground of excommunication. 2. Excommunication being a Church-cenſure, had onely ſin for its object; nor did a leprous man more deſerve excommunication with them, then a plaguy man doth with us. Excommunication is the key of Diſcipline, to ſhut out of heaven, *Matth.* 16.19. a bond to retain ſin; compare *Matth.* 18.18. with *John* 20.23. a thunderclap, not againſt naturall infirmities, but ſinfull enormities. Indeed perſons Levitically polluted, might for preſent be materially excommunicated, as being ſeparated or ſhut without the Camp for fear of contagion, and ſo are plaguy perſons with us; but this is as far from formall Excommunication, as a dead body is from

a living man. 3. Its evident by the practice of the Jews, amongſt whom the firſt degree of Excommunication, called *Niddui*, laſted for thirty daies, unleſs it were ſhortened by repentance; but onely ſin is the object of repentance, and not a bloudy iſſue, or other Leviticall pollutions. See *Buxtorf*, *Budæus*, *Godwin*, &c.

See *Aarons Rod bloſſoming*, l. 1. c. 9. & 10. & 12.

4. Its evident that this firſt degree of Excommunication, called *Niddui*, was a barre in particular to the Paſſeover (which anſwers our Lords Supper) ſince it *ſignified a ſeparation from all commerce with any man or woman for the diſtance of four cubits, and particularly from eating or drinking with any.* And hence probably flowed that expreſſion of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. *With ſuch a one no not to eat.* Which is as extendable with us to our Sacramentall eating, as it was with the Jews. I might bring as a proof of Excommunication *Gen.* 17. 14. which is a cutting off from the Church of God, and that not for Leviticall pollutions, but for wilfull omiſſions or commiſſions. See *Mercer* upon the place.

His Argument then from *the elder Brother the Paſſeover*, is like *Reuben*, unſtable

unſtable as water. Let us ſee whether he can draw a ſtronger argument from *the younger brother our Sacrament* (as he is pleaſed to tearm it.)

His firſt proof is from 1 Cor. 10. 17. *We being many, are all partakers of one bread.* Thence he concludes, *That divers of the Corinthians were ready to go to Idols.* verſe 14. *yet all were admitted to the Sacrament.*

1. The dehortation doth not neceſſarily prove they were Idolaters, though indeed too many of them, eſpecially the ſtronger Chriſtians, abuſed their liberty in eating things ſacrificed to Idols, to the offence of their weaker brethren, and ſometimes (which was more ſcandalous) in the Idols Temple: this they did as apprehending the thing was indifferent; and by uſing their utmoſt liberty, went beyond the bounds, judging any place of eating lawfull (and that without weighing circumſtances) as well as any meats lawfull, 1 *Cor.* 8. 10. This, though bad, was not (eſpecially before ſufficient admonition given) a juſt barre to their receiving. *Anſw.*

2. Yet taking it for granted, many of them were guilty of greater ſins, as appears

pears by 1 *Cor.*15. & 2 *Cor.*12.21. How proves he from the place, that all these were notwithstanding admitted. As all Jews might eat the Passeover, so all Church Members might receive the Lords Supper. All circumcised persons had a right to the Passeover, yet some of them might not injoy it at all times, *Numb.*9.7. So all baptized persons have a right to the Lords Supper, yet may not alwaies actually use this their right; nay not all true converts neither, till they be worthy actually as well as habitually. A person may be capable *in actu primo*, yet not *in actu secundo*. All the Priests had a right to the holy things, yet were not permitted at any time to make use of that right, *Levit.*22.2,7.

3. Supposing all did receive it promiscuously, how proves he from this place, that the Apostle did allow that free admission? doth the drawing an argument from practice, allow that practice? Then by arguing from baptizing for the dead, the Apostle should allow baptizing for the dead, 1 *Cor.*15.29. From their actuall communicating the Apostle proves they were one body; and secondly, That they ought not to communicate with Idols.

Idols. Doth this manner of arguing neceſſarily juſtifie their admitting all to Communicate pell mell at any time?

Whereas *pag.*7. he urges, *That they were drunken together at the Lords Table.*

Anſw. 1. Then it ſeems they were not drunk before, but at the Table; and how can that be a let to receiving which was cauſed by receiving, unleſs he will make the Effect an impediment to the Cauſe, the Conſequent to the Antecedent.

2. But granting this drunkenneſs were at their love Feaſts, which preceded the Lords Supper. I anſwer, Its more then Mr. *H.* can prove, that they were drunken in the ordinary and ſtrict ſenſe, ſince in Scripture phraſe the words μεθύω and *Shachar* ſignifie, though liberall drinking, yet within the bounds of temperance, as is evident, *Iohn* 3.10. *Gen.*43.34. *Cant.*5.1. And the Apoſtle reproves them rather for diſorder and uncharitableneſs, then for exceſs; that they ſtayed not for their Brethren, whereby the rich fed and drunk liberally when the poor were hungry and thirſty. Compare *ver.*22.& 33. 3. What Logick is in this conſequence (ſuppoſing they were drunk indeed?) Saint *Paul* reproves them for coming drunk to the Sacrament;

Sacrament; *ergo*, they ought to come to the Sacrament, even though they be drunk. Is not the quite contrary more rationall, St. *Paul* reproved them for coming when drunk to the Sacrament; *ergo*, they ought not to come when drunk to the Sacrament.

His next proof is from 1 *Cor.* 10.4,5. By the way, where he ſaies, *They were all admitted freely to our Sacrament.* He ſpeaks *gratis.* Indeed, if he ſpeak as to the thing ſignified, undoubtedly their and our Sacraments are all one, and thus even Circumciſion and the Paſſeover were the ſame with our Baptiſme and the Lords Supper; but as to the outward elements, I think there's a great difference between their Manna and our Bread, their Water out of the rock, and our Wine. But for the thing it ſelf, if he will make that a preſident for free admiſſion, then unbaptized perſons, yea perſons diſtracted, Infants, and excommunicated perſons, by this rule may partake of the Lords Supper, as there uncircumciſed perſons, &c. did partake of thoſe Sacraments. Yea, many who were born after their paſſing the Sea, and ſo not baptized neither, yet ate of the Manna, and

and drank of the rocks. Witneſs 1. The mixed multitude that went out of *Egypt* with them, *Exod.* 12.38. 2. Many of the *Iſraelites* themſelves who were uncircumciſed in the wilderneſs, *Joſh.* 5.5. yet did eat of the Manna and drank of the rock.

2. Their partaking univerſally of that Sacramentall Meat and Drink, is no argument for our free admiſſion, till Mr. *H.* can make out as great a neceſſity for our univerſall receiving as for theirs; namely, that all who receive not, muſt both ſtarve and choak, that Sacramentall Bread and Water being their daily and neceſſary repaſt. Nor will Mr. *H.* evade this anſwer by his parallels *pag.* 8. which do not run on four feet, as we ſay. And however their Sacraments and ours, their condition and ours may agree in divers reſpects; and it be very true, that God is not well pleaſed with many Receivers amongſt us, no more then amongſt them; yet herein is a manifeſt difference, that their Sacramentall Elements had a double uſe and end; namely, to nouriſh their bodies as well as their ſoules; nor had they ordinarily in the Wilderneſs other food to live upon, and therefore they

they muſt either receive thoſe Sacraments or die. I hope there is not ſuch an abſolute neceſſity of our Sacramentall Bread and Wine. Had God made our daily food (as he did to them) a Sacrament, I ſay then it were cruelty and murder to deny any man the Sacrament, and then not onely monthly, but alſo weekly, yea daily Sacraments had been neceſſary: but that muſt have been by accident, not from the nature of a Sacrament.

Page 9. His next Argument is drawn from the generall invitation to the Marriage Feaſt, *Matth.*22, & *Luke* 14.

Anſw. 1. Let him prove, that by the Marriage Feaſt is there meant in particular the Lords Supper. Chriſt indeed is the Feaſt to which all are invited; the Ordinances, and eſpecially the Word and Sacraments, are the Diſhes in which this Feaſt is ſerved. Now the queſtion is not, Whether all ought to come to the Feaſt? but, Whether all muſt eat of the Feaſt in the Diſh of the Sacrament, as well as of the Word? The former is aſſerted, but not proved by Mr. *Humphrey*.

2. Since the main ſcope of the parable is to hold forth the rejecting of the Jews and calling of the Gentiles (which is the rule

rule Mr. *H.* himſelf goes by *pag.9.*) *Mat.* 22.43. compared with *Mat.*22.1. will it not follow then, that not onely Church members, but alſo Heathen ſhould immediately be admitted, yea forced to this Sacrament.

3. Yet further, if all muſt be admitted, how came the unthankfull Gueſts to be excluded by the Lords own command? who yet had farre better excuſes to keep from the Sacrament then many of our Profeſſors have, *Luke* 14.18,20. Lu.14 29

4. If this be meant particularly of the Lords Supper, then let me ask Mr. *H.* whether ſome worldly occaſions may not juſtly excuſe our abſence? and whether all are judged there unworthy, who are ſometimes kept from the Lords Supper by their worldly occaſions? The weightieſt occaſions cannot excuſe any from the Marriage Feaſt. But I think Mr. *H.* will not deny, but ſome worldly occaſions may excuſe a man from the Sacrament, as is evident by analogy, *Numb.9.10.*

More might be added to ſhew the weakneſs of his plea from theſe parables. But whereas he addes *pag.*10. *Now who is that faithfull ſteward, that gives the houſhold their portion of meat in due ſeaſon,*

but

but theſe that are thus doing, that is, who admit all comers, as himſelf there interprets. What a groſs, ſenſleſs, and profane interpretation is this? For 1. What an eaſie matter is it to be a faithfull ſteward, if this faithfulneſs lie in admitting all pell mell to the Sacrament. 2. Will it not follow by this rule, that the profaneſt Miniſters, who are moſt for free admiſſion, are the moſt faithfull ſtewards. 3. That the moſt pious and conſcientious Miniſters, who dare not give this bread of children to dogs, are therefore unfaithfull ſtewards? Lord! whither will not a ſelfiſh opinion lead a man?

Whereas he there addes, *That Iohn Baptiſt admitted all comers to Baptiſme, yea even thoſe whom he calls vipers.*

Anſw. 1. He ſaies, but proves not, that *Iohn* did baptize all comers. 2. *Matth.* 3. 6. Its noted that they who were baptized confeſſed their ſins, and ſo made publick profeſſion of their repentance. Let our people do that privately before the Elderſhip which theſe did publickly before all the world; or (if they pleaſe) let them do it publickly before all the world, as the former did, and ſee if we refuſe them to the Sacrament. Should we require confeſſion

feſſion of ſins in every Receiver before admiſſion to the Lords Supper, we ſhould be branded with a witneſs, as pleaders for Auricular confeſſion. We onely deſire a profeſſion of their faith before receiving, which though weak, yet if true in the judgement of charity, we dare not refuſe ſuch. And becauſe we are ſure there can be no faith without knowledge, therefore as we our ſelves have been tried by others, and that willingly, we think it our duty to try the faith and knowledge of all under our charge: and if we finde any groſly ignorant, as we dare not at preſent admit them, ſo we are willing to take pains with them, by inſtruction to fit them for the Sacrament in future. Whether this be more pleaſing to God, or the admiſſion of all hand over head, I appeal to the Readers judgement, and to Mr. *Humphrey* his conſcience.

Whereas for further confirmation he adds, *Adultis eadem eſt ratio utriuſque Sacramenti*,

I deny it, if taken in the latitude. For 1. Heathen may be admitted to baptiſme, but not to the Lords Supper, by his own grant. 2. Taking this Maxime for granted, what follows, but that as per-

Anſw. I mean *Catechumeni.*

sons to be baptized must profess faith and repentance, *Mat.* 3.6. *Act.* 8. 37. so must they also before receiving; which makes much for our purpose, and against Mr. *Humphrey*.

His last proof is drawn from *Act.* 10.28. upon which instance he concludes with a rhetoricall Doxology, *pag.* 11. *I thank God I have learned this same lesson with a satisfied conscience, to esteem no man unclean, but all (unless excommunicated) free in the use of Gods Ordinances.*

Answ. 1. That God, who had taught *Peter* to count no man unclean, taught *Paul* to count some men unclean, yea persons within the Church and not excommunicated, *Tit.* 1.15,16.

2. Let Mr. *Humphrey* shew me the force of this consequence, *Peter* was commanded to converse with a godly man, though levitically unclean (as not being circumcised and a proselyte) which uncleanness after the death of Christ was taken away; *Ergo, Paul* ought to converse with a profane Christian that is morally unclean. How suitable this is to Scripture, see 1 *Cor.* 5.11. Further, *Peter* is commanded to preach the Word to Heathen, that were comers on, and ready

ready to receive it; *ergo*, *Paul* may administer the Sacrament to all ignorant and wicked Christians that reject Christ and his Word. I wish he would play the Logician more, and the Rhetorician less, in matters of this nature, lest he be found in the number of those, *Rom.* 16. 18. who by good words and fair speeches deceive the hearts of the simple.

3. Consider how he contradicts himself as well as the truth; *pag.* 3. he excluded Infants and distracted persons, here his charity is so large as to exclude none but excommunicated persons.

4. That by excluding excommunicated persons from the Word preached, he runs into an uncharitable and dangerous errour, hath been formerly proved, which I will not here repeat. Much more might be added, had I leasure to follow him in his wild-goose-chace. I think he may well be accounted a Master of Arts at wresting the Scripture; and whether he hath writ more words or errours, seems to me a disputable point.

For a further flourish, in the same Page he heaps up Texts of Scripture that hold forth the offers of free grace to all, which make as much for free admission

to the ſeal of this Sacrament, as an offer of pardon to all rebels, proves, that even thoſe rebels muſt have their pardons ſealed who ſtand out againſt their Prince, as well as thoſe that come in and ſubmit upon pardon offered. Let Mr. *Humphrey* and all the world know, that we deſire to keep none from the ſeal, who will pleaſe to make it out to us, that (but in the judgement of charity) they have a right to the thing ſignified. Which may ſerve to take away that wonder of his, *How we can have the conſcience to turn them away from the ſignes and means of grace in this Ordinance, to whom the Goſpel offers Chriſt freely.*

Anſw. 1. With what conſcience can he exclude Infants, diſtracted and excommunicated perſons, to whom the Goſpel offers Chriſt as freely as to any? yea each of which may have the things ſignified, and yet be denied the ſigne.

2. Not generall offers of Chriſt, but our actuall receiving of him viſibly, is the rule of admiſſion to the Sacrament. But how many perſons do viſibly reject Chriſt, at leaſt by conſequence, *Tit.* 1. 16. and they who viſibly reject the thing ſignified, may juſtly be debarred the

ſign

ſign, till they manifeſt their repentance. Thus much for his proofs from Scripture. Let us now proceed to his reaſons, and ſee whether he be better at argument then at quotation.

His firſt Argument is, *The Sacraments are* verbum viſibile, *a viſible Goſpel*, &c. *therefore the ſame latitude muſt be granted to them both* (meaning the Word preached and the Sacrament) *in their adminiſtration.* And here he triumphs (poor man) before the victory, in theſe words immediately following, *Upon this ground, me thinks, I ſtand as upon a rock, againſt which all objections, like waves, do but daſh themſelves in pieces.*

1. If the Sacrament have the ſame latitude with the Word, then a Turk or Heathen may receive as well as a Chriſtian; but this is contrary to Mr. *Humphrey* his profeſſed principles, as well as to the truth it ſelf. *Anſw.*

2. His conſequence will not hold, unleſs he can prove that *verbum viſibile* converts as well as *verbum audibile*, and that it was inſtituted for that purpoſe.

3. Though it ſhould convert, it proves onely that all ſhould be preſent, not that all ſhould receive.

4. Granting his foundation, I retort it upon himself. As the Word preached is applicable to all, so also the Sacraments; But the Word preached is not immediately applicable to all; I mean as to that part of its gracious offer which is particularly tendered and sealed in the Sacrament. For instance, there are some righteous persons (in their own conceit) that Christ came not to call. *Mat.*9.13. many self-justitiaries and conceited *Laodiceans*, to whom in that condition mercy is not immediately applicable; But to whom *in statu quo*, the Covenant is not applicable, to them the seales of it are not applicable; and where such may be discerned by their gross ignorance or scandall, they are visibly as well as really unworthy, and should not be permitted to receive, where there is a just Authority to exclude them.

2. To come a little closer to Mr. *H.* As the Word preached may be heard by all, yet cannot be applied to all in divers things, so the word *visible* (the Lords Supper) may be seen by all, but ought not to be applied to all in divers cases; namely, when that which is sealed in the Sacrament is not immediately applicable

cable to them by the Word, for the Word and Sacrament muſt go hand in hand together. *Ergo*, where the covenant of grace is not viſibly applicable, there the viſible ſign of that covenant is not applicable. But the covenant of grace is viſibly unapplicable to many perſons in the boſome of the viſible Church; *ergo*. And thus Mr. *H.* his rock proves but a quick-ſand, and his viſible Word makes againſt himſelf.

His amplification from *pag.* 11. to the 15. is as impertinent as his Argument is weak. We eaſily grant, the Lords Supper declares the covenant of grace as a ſign, and ratifies it as a ſeal; but that its therefore to be applied to all, is a meer *non ſequitur*. Indeed where grace is freely offered by an audible word, all may, yea and ſhould hear it; and where its offered by a viſible word, all have liberty to ſee it, and ſo may be preſent at the adminiſtration of the Lords Supper, as well as at preaching and Baptiſme: But that all ought actually to partake (be they in what ſtate they will, unleſs uncapable by age, dotage, or excommunication) is a new light ſtarted by Mr. *Humphrey*, which like an *ignis fatuus* will lead thouſands

into utter darkneſs. Had Mr. *H.* either read or underſtood our meaning (as eaſily he might, had he pleaſed, by what is extant in print in a firſt and ſecond diſcourſe by the Antiquæriſt) he would not have ſhot ſo wide at rovers as now he doth. The hinge of the controverſie turns not upon this point, Whether all may be preſent when the covenant of grace is ſigned, offered, and ſealed in the Sacrament, but whether all preſent may actually partake thereof; and in particular thoſe who viſibly reject the covenant of grace that is ſigned, offered, and ſealed by it. To keep to Mr. *H.* his own ſimilitude, *pag.* 14. A generall pardon ſent by a Prince, may be offered to all Rebels within his Dominion, all of them may hear the pardon read, and if need be, ſee it ſealed; upon which ſome come in and ſubmit really, others profeſſedly ſtand out againſt pardon offered; a third ſort ſeemingly ſubmit, yet ſecretly carry about them daggers or poyſon to murder their Prince. The King knows this, and his Ambaſſadours ſtrongly ſuſpect it. Now I ask Mr. *H.* 1. Whether pardon ſhall be ſealed particularly to them that openly ſtand it out? 2. Whether the Am-

Ambaſſadours ought not to try all that ſubmit, that it may appear who ſubmit really and who treacherouſly; and the latter being found out, is Mr. *Humphrey* of the minde that pardon ſhould particularly be ſealed to them, as well as to thoſe who ſubmit really? If ſo, I think he is a better friend to Traytors then to good Subjects or good Government. Apply this caſe to the Lords Supper, and it will quickly put an end to this controverſie, now again unhappily raiſed by Mr. *Humphrey*, to the no ſmall joy of profane and ignorant perſons, and grief of Gods people. Every Sacrament ſeals, 1. The truth of the covenant of grace. 2. Its generall offer. 3. By ſome of the Sacramentall actions it doth inſtrumentally apply the Covenant to every worthy Receiver, and to none elſe. Now (if Mr. *H.* and other diſſenters will pleaſe to underſtand us aright) all may ſee the truth of the Covenant of Grace, and its generall offer ſealed, and ſo may be preſent at the whole adminiſtration, which is made up of ſeverall Ordinances, the ſight and hearing whereof may be very profitable for all ſorts. But that the Covenant of Grace ſhould be inſtrumentally applied,

per

per ſigilla, to all ſorts, is in a manner as bad as if it ſhould be applied to them by word of mouth, and haply in ſome ſenſe worſe. Dares Mr. *H.* ſay to any perſon viſibly in the ſtate of nature, Sir, be aſſured that Chriſt and all the benefits of the Covenant of Grace are actually and for ever yours? And will he dare to ſeal that which he dares not ſay? The language of every actuall giving is, Chriſt is thine in particular, and of every actuall receiving is, Chriſt is mine in particular. And ſhall any Miniſter dare ſolemnly to deceive any ſelf-deceiving perſon, and confirm him in preſumption, to the ruine of his ſoul, when he may regularly prevent that miſchief? If this be not a ſtrengthening of the hands of the wicked, *Ezek.* 13.22. I beſeech you what is?

To anſwer therefore briefly to his four Conſiderations, held forth by way of concluſion, *pag.* 15.16. & 17. To the firſt I anſwer, Thoſe whom we would not baptize, had they been to have been baptized at yeers of diſcretion, thoſe we cannot admit to the Lords Supper, though baptized in their infancy. And I ask Mr. *H.* whether there be not many ſuch in *England*, who yet are neither children,

children, nor fools, nor excommunicated? And here let Mr. *H.* remember his own rule, p. 10. *Adultis eadem eſt ratio utriuſque Sacramenti.*

To the ſecond. The queſtion is not about the freeneſs of the offer, but about the freeneſs of acceptance; and whether they who viſibly reject grace freely offered, ought to be admitted to the ſign and ſeal of that grace. And here let me ask Mr. *H.* again, whether his conſcience did not check him for aſperſing us with that foul ſlander, *pag.* 16. *That we admit none but ſuch as are qualified to our own minde.* Doth not Mr. *H.* know that we plead not onely the Word of God (which is abundantly enough) but alſo the Authority of Parliament, for what we do in this point; by whoſe Ordinance, not repealed, we are civilly inabled to do what we do; and have alſo from them (after mature deliberation with the Aſſembly of Divines) a rule to walk by, againſt which if we tranſgreſs, we are accountable to the civill Magiſtrate; and dares he notwithſtanding charge us with admittance of none but ſuch as are qualified to our minde? Or, 2. That in thus doing, *we will not let people come without their*

their price and money to this Ordinance? Do godly Parents and Maſters, by keeping their children and ſervants from the Sacrament till they be ſufficiently inſtructed in the main grounds of Religion, do they, I ſay, in this pious act put them upon it, not to come to the Lords Supper, till they can bring their price and money to this Ordinance? and yet ſhall godly Miniſters and Elders, who are ſpirituall parents, and alſo ſpecially inabled by the Magiſtrate, a civil Parent, to do the like, be judged (by one ſcarce out of the ſhell, either in Learning or Divinity) as if they were all the children of *Simon Magus*, and drove a bargain of Chriſt and the Sacrament for money, becauſe they are carefull that perſons viſibly unqualified, and who think to purchaſe Chriſt and grace for money, may not have either him or it upon ſuch baſe tearms? 3. Is he not yet more aſhamed, in the ſame page to affirm, *Why this is even as they conceive of* Judas, *who being about to ſell our Saviour, went out to make his bargain at the Supper.* It ſeems, if Mr. *H.* may be judge, 1. We are a company of *Judaſſes.* 2. We betray Chriſt, becauſe we will not ſuffer others to murder him.

3. We

3. We drive a bargain for the buying and ſelling of Chriſt, becauſe we uſe a rod made by Chriſt and publick Authority, to whip the buyers and ſellers out of Gods Temple. Thus in the judgement of greater and wiſer men then Mr. *H.* Chriſt was an enemy to *Cæſar*, *Paul* a ſeditious fellow, &c. The very mention of this ſlander is enough to refute it. I ſay no more, but the Lord rebuke and forgive the Authour of it.

To his third Conſideration I anſwer, 1. Its very dubitable, whether full conviction be enough to converſion; yea, the ſtronger conviction is in the underſtanding, the higher doth the will and affections riſe againſt it(if not conquered and ſanctified by grace, *Rom.* 7. 8,9.) yea to the commiſſion of the ſin againſt the holy Ghoſt, *Heb.*6.4,5,6.

2. *That by application of the ſeal, the meſſage of reconciliation comes in its full vertue, for the working this conviction and faith unto ſalvation,* is both a groſs and implicated errour, as hath in part been formerly proved. For 1. Conviction of the truth and generall offer of the Covenant comes not by the Sacrament, as ſealing and applying to perſons (which rather

rather conduceth to the faith of particular evidence) but as ſignifying and offering Chriſt to all, who therefore may with great profit be preſent at the Ordinance. 2. Conviction that Chriſt is mine in particular, cannot be wrought by actuall receiving in any but the worthy receiver, and ſuch is no ignorant perſon, or any that lives and lies in a known ſin, who therefore cannot receive but to his own prejudice, nor by Church-officers be admitted to receive (if viſibly ſo) without their prejudice alſo, who ſuffer him to contract the guilt of Chriſts body and blood, to eat and drink judgement to himſelf, and to do an act that cannot either convert or edifie him *in ſtatu quo*, but aggravate his ſin and judgement, as hereafter (by Gods aſſiſtance) ſhall more fully appear.

Before I paſs to his fourth conſideration, there lies in the way one objection which is worth the anſwering, which ſeems to croſs our former aſſertion.

Object. Chriſt ſuffered *Judas* to partake of the Lords Supper as well as the reſt, yet by that act ſealed not to him that Chriſt was his, and himſelf was in the ſtate of grace, &c. for then he muſt have ſealed

to

to a falſity, &c. *Ergo*, the act of giving and receiving in the Sacrament is no ſeal of evidence to any, much leſs to all.

Suppoſing the objection were true; actuall giving and receiving, ſeals either Chriſt or judgement to every Receiver, and he that eats and drinks not Chriſt, eats and drinks judgement to himſelf, 1 *Cor.* 11.29. *Anſw.*

2. In its own nature and primary intention it ſeals Chriſt and mercy.

3. The Miniſter in his acting *ex officio*, applies mercy *charitativè* to all the Receivers who are viſibly worthy.

4. When therefore the Miniſter ſees any preſent who are viſibly unworthy, if he he inabled by judiciall power, he muſt not permit him to receive: if not (as it falls out where no Presbytery is ſettled) he muſt either perſwade ſuch a perſon to forbear, or elſe in plain tearms tell him the danger of his unworthy receiving, and that he will prove a murderer of Chriſt, as our Saviour did unto *Judas*: by which forewarning, I humbly conceive where Church-Government is not ſettled, the Miniſter may clear his own ſoul, as having not power of himſelf to admit or keep back without judiciall proceſs,

proceſs, wherein himſelf cannot be both judge and witneſs. And thus both word and ſeal go together, and aſſure particular mercy or judgement to Receivers, as they are worthy or unworthy; as the Prieſts word went along with the bitter water, to do the honeſt woman good, but the adultreſs hurt, *Numb.* 5. 19, 22, 27, 29. *Contra*, though the Word make moſt worſe, yet it makes very many bad ones good: but the Sacrament makes onely good ones better.

Object. But doth not the Miniſter ſeal to a lie, by giving the Sacrament to thoſe who are viſibly worthy, yet really unworthy?

Anſw. He may poſſibly ſeal to an untruth, but doth not ſeal to a lie, as admitting that perſon whom in charity (being approved upon due triall) he may and ought to judge worthy: As I may ſpeak comfort to one whom I judge to be in the ſtate of grace, yet may very eaſily be miſtaken about his condition. 2. If the Miniſter notwithſtanding ſuſpect a perſon, though legally approved, he may and ought the more carefully to warn him to look to it he be what he profeſſes himſelf to be, leſt otherwiſe for all mans approbation, he eat and drink judgement to himſelf. And

by

by this means I conceive he may clear himſelf, but cannot keep back him that is approved by the major vote of the Elderſhip: onely afterwards hath power to appeal to the Claſſis, in caſe he perceive the Elderſhip prevaricate and conſpire to admit unworthy ones out of by-reſpects; as they likewiſe may do of the Miniſter. But all this doth not countenance the admiſſion of any who may be regularly ſuſpended, no more then of him who is to be excommunicated, but is not, through corruption of the Elderſhip.

For his fourth Conſideration, we grant the Goſpel is the Goſpel of peace, &c. yet its as true, that whereever it comes it occaſions war; not of its own nature, but by means of humane corruption, *Mat.* 10. 34,35. and that by means of ſeparation which it makes whereever it comes. And is it any wonder then, that the ſeals of this Goſpel by making ſeparation, make alſo diviſion? Where the promiſes are not applicable ſo much as viſibly, there ſure the ſeals of thoſe promiſes are not applicable; the deniall whereof yet muſt needs vex hypocrites, who by this means are pried into, and Pag. 26.

uncaſed, as a ſoul-ſearching Miniſtry doth; and no wonder then if the devil of contention be conjured up, and Gods *Jeremies*, who ſeparate the precious from the vile, be men of contention to the whole Earth. *Cain* will be angry if *Abel* finde better acceptance then himſelf; and hypocrites, who care leaſt for reall goodneſs, yet are very ambitious of all the priviledges of piety, and proclaim war againſt ſuch as deny them, though never ſo juſtly, (as the Phariſees did againſt our Saviour) but I pray who deſerve blame for this contention, Gods faithfull Miniſters or hypocrites themſelves, who by viſible unworthineſs deprive themſelves of thoſe priviledges, and yet malign Chriſts Stewards, who dare not be ſo laviſh and prodigall of their Maſters proviſions as theſe perſons would have them. What therefore he adds by way of rhetoricall amplification is frivolous as to his purpoſe, ſince none are Saints but ſuch ſinners, and none to be approved for Saints by the Church, but ſuch as acknowledge themſelves great ſinners. But the queſtion is, Whether ſuch as think themſelves righteous, though eaſily convinceable of groſs ignorance

norance or wickedneſs (as the Phariſees) are to be admitted to this Sacrament amongſt humbled and repenting ſinners?

His proviſion inſerted in his third Edition, *pag.* 17 will ſtand him in little ſtead, ſince his very ſtating the queſtion, overthrows his great *Diana* of free Admiſſion.

For 1. He will have free Admiſſion, and yet himſelf rails about the Communion Table from Infants, diſtracted perſons, &c. He that cries out of Suſpenſion, yet takes upon himſelf to ſuſpend a world of perſons far more worthy then, or not ſo unworthy as many he preſumes to admit. Shall the Lords Supper be free for blaſphemers, murderers, &c. and not free for Infants, diſtracted perſons? &c.

2. If he can prove it is againſt Scripture-order and decency, to admit to the Lords Supper a perſon viſibly worthy, though unbaptized, I will eaſily prove its more againſt order and decency to admit to the Lords Supper a perſon viſibly unworthy, though baptized. Had *Conſtantine* the great and *Julian* the Apoſtate been contemporary, I ſhould rather have admitted the former to receive, when unbaptized, then the latter, though baptized.

3. Whatever Mr. *H.* inſinuates in the

cloſe of his Proviſion, we are as much both for Order and for the Ordinances as himſelf; and could not the Ordinances be had without diſorder, we had rather diſpence with Order, then part with the Ordinances. The difference then between us is this. We plead for, and (bleſſed be God) injoy the Lords Supper with order and decency; Mr. *H.* pleads for it, and injoyes it with diſorder and confuſion, whatever he pretends in his Proviſion to the contrary.

His ſecond Argument he draws from the nature of the viſible Church; which he defines or deſcribes to be a number of ſuch as make profeſſion of Jeſus Chriſt, and ſo are Saints by calling, whatever they are in truth. The eſſentiall marks whereof (whereby it ſubſiſts as viſible) is the preaching of the Word, and adminiſtration of the Sacraments. Now unleſs men will be ſo bold as to diveſt our mixed Congregations (and ſo conſequently all England *formerly) of the name of the viſible Church, they cannot take from us one of its eſſentiall notes, in the free uſe of this Ordinance.*

Anſw. 1. His deſcription is liable enough to exception, ſince a viſible Church ſtrictly is not a bare number of Profeſſors, but of

of ſuch as combine for Church ends. The Church is a Corporation, and not members as ſo, make a body, but as united either by virtuall or actuall conſent, &c. and that either in their diſtinct Societies, which we call Pariſhes or particular Congregations, or in their Repreſentees and Officers delegated for the publick concernment of particular Churches, either in a Claſſis, Province, Nation, divers Nations, or the whole world, whence ariſe Claſſicall, Provinciall, Nationall, or Oecumenicall Aſſemblies, &c.

But ſuppoſing this to be his meaning, though not ſo clearly expreſſed,

2. I ask him in the next place, Whether all Profeſſors or Saints by calling, are *eo nomine* to be admitted to the Lords Supper; if ſo, then why doth he ſhut out children and diſtracted perſons, who are as truly Saints by calling, and profeſſors as others. Its apparent then that outward profeſſion is not the ultimate reaſon of admiſſion, unleſs accompanied with ſutable knowledge and converſation, at leaſt viſibly; and that groſs ignorance appearing, or a ſcandalous converſation, do ſo far contradict Mr. *H.* his outſide profeſſion, as to make that perſon

ſon for preſent viſibly unworthy.

3. Taking it for granted, that the Word and Sacraments are notes of a true viſible Church, how doth it follow that ours are not true Churches, unleſs every particular member may partake of the Lords Supper? How many children and ſervants were in the daies of the Prelates kept from the Lords Supper, till they could give ſome tolerable account of their faith, and of the nature and uſe of the Sacrament; yet never was ſuch a mad inference as this drawn from it, that therefore the Church of *England* was not a true viſible Church. And certainly, if the deniall of ſome Church priviledge (though unjuſtly) were enough to un-Church a people, I ſcarce know where there is any one true viſible Church in all the world.

4. Therefore let all the world take notice of the too too groſs fallacy of this Argument, The Word and Sacraments are notes of a true viſible Church; *Ergo*, Without free admiſſion we have no true viſible Church. May not any ordinary capacity eaſily diſcern there are four tearms in this Syllogiſme.

The Syllogiſme ſhould run thus: The

Word

Word and Sacraments are eſſentiall notes of a true viſible Church; *Ergo*, without the Word and Sacraments there is no true viſible Church. But that Mr. *H.* ſaw well enough would conclude nothing againſt us, who (bleſſed be God) have both Word and Sacraments, and therefore in ſtead thereof (againſt the known rules of Logick) he ſhuffles in free Admiſſion into the concluſion, which was not at all in the premiſes. A clear evidence he is more skill'd in Sophiſtry then in Logick, and can better deceive then convince.

If on the other hand, he will make free admiſſion to the Lords Supper an eſſentiall mark of a true viſible Church; let him ſee how he is confuted by the practice of our Church under the Prelates, in which many were kept from the Lords Supper, that were neither children, fools, nor excommunicated, and that without any prejudice to the eſſence of our Churches, as was before inſtanced. Yea, the very Rubrick before the Communion in the Book of Common-Prayer, ſhews the fondneſs of this opinion; the Curate being there authorized to ſuſpend ſcandalous and malicious per-

ſons, without (I hope) any prejudice to the true being of our Churches. Yea, the very Exhortation in the Communion commands ſuch to bewail their ſins, and not to come, leſt after the taking of the Sacrament, the Devil entred into them as he did into *Judas*. Now were it a duty for all to come, then were it a ſin to forbid any to come.

Object. If yet he will object, This practice of ours, if it be not againſt the nature and eſſence, yet its againſt the wellbeing of a true viſible Church, when the members thereof, or any of them, are denied their juſt priviledges.

Anſw. 1. True, if the Lords Supper were a priviledge due to all Members; but this is the thing to be proved on Mr. *Humphrey* his part; and in the proof whereof (though his great *Diana*) he falls ſo exceeding ſhort.

2. The well being of a Church conſiſts much in its Government and Diſcipline, (of which not one word from Mr. *H.* in his notes of a true viſible Church) Good Government lies in the Geometricall (not Arithmeticall) adminiſtration of priviledges and Cenſures: the loweſt of which laſt (Admonition) and higheſt (Ex-

(Excommunication) we have clear enough in the Scripture: but becauſe Suſpenſion and the like, are not in tearms mentioned in Scripture, therefore Mr. *H.* will have it wholly expunged; as if becauſe a man will not be gained by words, there were no other way but preſently to knock him on the head. Certainly, he that puts the extreames, cannot deny the middle from one extream to another. And as he who hath power of life and death, hath much more power to mulct, impriſon, &c. ſo the Church who hath power to excommunicate, hath much more power to ſuſpend, as being an inferiour Cenſure, and but the way to that higheſt. Will Mr. *H.* deny, that the well-being of a Church lies much in its purity, and this in the knowledge and converſation of the Members? and whether our way or his conduce more to this, let all the world judge. Let Mr. *H.* tell me ingenuouſly, whether he would have all groſly ignorant perſons excommunicated? I hope he is more charitable, and thinks they rather need inſtruction. And is not this previous triall before the Elderſhip uſed of purpoſe, that ignorant perſons might be put upon enquiry after knowledge.

ledge, as ever they value the priviledge of Sacramentall communion. Nor is the proper end of it excluſion from, but preparation of all ſorts for the Sacrament, for which in few months (by Gods grace) we dare undertake to fit the meaneſt, if they will be ruled by us. *Contra*, if Mr. *H.* his free Admiſſion obtain univerſally without check, ſee if in a few years a Chaos of darkneſs and ignorance do not overſpread the face of this glorious Church. But I ſee I muſt contract.

For his confirmation of this argument from the parable of the field, &c. which he ſtiles an *invincible ſupport*, *pag.* 17. Alas poor man, how feeble muſt he needs be, when his beſt ſtrength is but weakneſs? If the Tares and Wheat muſt be ſeparated till the day of judgement; then I pray what will become of Excommunication? Its apparent by the parable, 1. That the Tares were ſowen by the careleſneſs of the Servants, or other Church members, *Matth.* 13. 25. 2. That the prohibition to take them away, was not abſolute, but onely with a caution or *proviſo*, *verſe* 29. And in truth, ſo tender is the Lord of the Wheat, that he had rather many Tares ſhould ſtand, then one

one ear of Corn ſhould be pluckt up. Where therefore there is danger of wronging the wheat, better let the tares ſtand; not ſo if we can ſeparate them without prejudice to, yea with advantage of the wheat: And therefore a bare ſuſpition is not enough to keep any from the Sacrament, but by groſs ignorance or ſcandall it muſt appear he is a tare, and not wheat, before he can be ſuſpended judicially. For as for negative ſuſpenſion before triall, that is not properly a Church Cenſure (no more then the non-admitting of Infants or diſtracted perſons) but onely a prudentiall forbearing to adminiſter the Lords Supper to a perſon, till he have been approved as viſibly worthy, which yet may iſſue out into a formall Suſpenſion, if any ſhall wilfully obtrude without triall, or upon triall ſhall be found viſibly unworthy, and yet will not be perſwaded to forbear till better prepared.

For his inſtance of Chriſts converſe with Publicanes and ſinners; it makes much for us, and againſt himſelf. Such Publicanes and ſinners who are not aſhamed publickly to profeſs their repentance and high reſpects to Chriſt, ſhall be very welcome

welcome to us as the worthieſt receivers; but the queſtion is, Whether blinde and ſcandalous Phariſees ought to be admitted with theſe Publicanes and ſinners?

For his grand inſtance of *Judas*, it hath been already anſwered. Onely I cannot but ſtand amazed at his high flown confidence and cenſoriouſneſs, pag. 19. *The evidence of which fact* (he means of Chriſts admitting *Judas* to receive the Lords Supper) *has ever appeared ſo fully to the Church, that this alone has been ground ſufficient to deduce their right of free admiſſion; and what need more indeed be urged, but that men when they are willing not to ſee, will let their hand (put over their eyes) be enough to blinde them.*

Anſw. 1. Sundry famous Lights in the Church beleeved this long before M. *H.* either preached or wrote, and yet thought it not ground enough for free admiſſion. But haply Mr. *H.* is ſo charitable, as to judge not onely the reformed Churches, but alſo the whole Church of *England* (ever ſince the dawning of Reformation after the *Marian* perſecution to this day) to have wilfully put their hands over their eyes, and knowingly to have

have ſinned againſt their conſciences. We may well bear this ſharp cenſure with the more comfort and patience, conſidering we ſuffer with ſo good company.

2. See you not how the vizard of humility falls off, and both his breath and pen ſavour rankly of pride in this unchriſtian cenſure? Were we as bad as Mr. *H.* would make us, we had undoubtedly made a great progreſs in the high way to the ſin againſt the holy Ghoſt, and deſerved our ſelves not onely to be ſuſpended, but alſo to be excommunicated. In the mean time I muſt be bold to tell Mr. *H.* that he who takes upon himſelf to be ſo free an admitter of others, deſerves, I fear, more then ſuſpenſion for this his ſcandalous and wicked cenſure of the generality of the moſt pious perſons of all the reformed Churches, and particularly his own Nation.

His third reaſon he takes from the nature of Chriſtian communion and Church fellowſhip, which ought to be in charity, in humility, without judging, every one eſteeming others better then themſelves, &c. eſpecially in the Miniſter, who is to be gentle to all, ſuffering the evil (ἀνεξίκακος) *to win them by this free way to repentance. And*

how

how impoſsible is this, if we muſt go to cenſuring of mens worthineſs and unworthineſs, preferring our ſelves, rejecting others? the ready way to nothing but heart burnings and diviſions, as we have too ſad experience already in moſt Congregations.

Anſw. 1. When men are out of the right way once, whither will they not ramble? Raſh judgement and private judgement cannot ſtand with charity and humility (out of his own mouth I condemn the man, who may well be ſtiled Maſter of Arts at raſh and private judging,) *ergo*, true and publick judging cannot ſtand with charity and humility. Doth he not in this deal with the Church, as ſome Anabaptiſts deal with the State, take away the Sword of Government, and ſo make a fair bridge for univerſall Toleration.

2. If there muſt be no judging in the Church, where then are Church Cenſures and Excommunication?

3. *Epheſus* is commended for trying and judging, *Rev.*2.2. and that ſhe could not bear thoſe that were evil, &c. and not therefore charged by Chriſt as proud or uncharitable.

4. The Apoſtle 1 *Cor.*5.12,13. commands

mands them to judge Church Members, that is (in Mr.*H.* his Language) to be proud and uncharitable.

5. Do we deſire any more of the meaneſt then we ſubmit to our ſelves; yea, to a far ſtricter triall then they are like to undergo? how then do we lift up our ſelves above them, or eſteem our ſelves better then they?

6. Doth the gentleneſs required in a Miniſter, forbid him to try and inſtruct his people? I thought gentleneſs there required, had been rather a qualification then a prohibition of Miniſteriall triall.

7. Doth ἀνεξίκακος there ſignifie a ſuffering the people in their ſins, that Miniſters ſhould be dumb dogs, and drowſie ſhepherds, ſuffering the ſheep to ramble as they pleaſe, and the ſwine to wallow as they pleaſe, &c. and admit them to the ſame priviledges with the beſt? Such a Miniſter may well be counted a good fellow, but ſure Chriſt will never reckon him for a good and faithfull ſhepherd. Doth Mr.*Humphrey* think the way to bring to repentance, is to ſuffer them in their ſins? or that there is no way to reduce them, but either admonition or excommunication? May not

not perſons be won by deniall of ſome priviledges due to regular members, if they have not loſt all ſpirituall ingenuity?

8. That hereby heart burnings and diviſions are occaſioned, blame not this excellent courſe, which of its own nature is a means of love and unity by the mutuall communication of Paſtor and Flock, Elders and People, in gifts and graces: but the pride of moſt, and ignorance or prejudice of ſome well meaning people, who will not ſubmit to this eaſie yoke, *Pſal.*2.1,3. *Matth.*11.29. nor do conſider, that the ruling Elders are either elected or eligible, 1. By themſelves. 2. Out of themſelves. 3. For their advantage, to allay the power of Miniſters, who if ſole Judges of Sacramentall worthineſs, might at leaſt be under a temptation to wrong weaker Chriſtians; and through paſſion or prejudice to keep them away, whom Chriſt would have to be admitted.

9. If by trying and judging others, we prefer our ſelves before others, then there muſt be no trying or judging of any in the Church; quite contrary to the Scripture, and the power of the Keyes given

given to Church-Officers. Beſides, let the Reader further take notice of the uncharitableneſs of this man. 1. In charging us to prefer our ſelves before others. True indeed, what the Apoſtle ſaith of bleſſing, *Heb.*7.7. that may we of triall and judgement, The Trier and Judge is in that act above him that is tried and judged: but did we prefer our ſelves to this ſuperiority? or were we called to it both by Civill and Eccleſiaſticall Authority? Doth not Mr. *Humphrey* try and judge others in the exerciſe of his Miniſtry, doth he therefore prefer himſelf above his people? indeed if he ran before he was ſent, well may he bear that charge. But we challenge Mr. *Humphrey* and all the world, to name any among us who take upon them to try or judge others, before they were called to that Office. Let him take heed leſt in this raſh cenſure he be not like *Corah* and his company, *Numb.*16.3.

3. To load us the more, he brands us in the cloſe with the odious charge of *rejecting others*, as if that were all the work of the Presbytery, to ſit and reject their brethren. He takes no notice how many are admitted, to the mutuall com-

fort and edification of themſelves and thoſe who are over them in the Lord, who bleſs God for the care our Builders take in purging and repairing Gods Houſe and the new *Jeruſalem*, however oppoſed and diſcouraged by *Sanballat*, *Tobiah*, and other *Samaritans*: and I wiſh too many (I hope reall *Jews*) did not too much correſpond with them, *Neh.6.*17,18,19. I am ſure Mr. *Humphrey* by this unhappy book of his, hath done *Sanballat* and *Tobiah* more ſervice then either *Nehemiah* or *Ezra*, the Lord forgive him.

Page 20. For amplification of his third Argument, he preſents the example of the Phariſee and Publicane; and inſinuates that we at leaſt ἐν εἴδει act the Phariſee.

Anſw. 1. How doth it follow, that by triall of others we think better of our ſelves then of others, as the Phariſee did here? His judgement was purely private. 2. Without any triall: Ours is publick, upon juſt and indifferent triall, whereby often we are brought to think better of others, worſe of our ſelves, but never to think better of our ſelves then others, whom yet in ſome caſes we dare not admit, ſince its poſſible one really worthy may

may be ſuſpended, and another onely viſibly worthy may be admitted; ſince in this, as well as other trials, the Elderſhip muſt proceed only *ſecundum allegata & probata*, and he who is worthy perſonally, may be unworthy diſpoſitively. And here again he chargeth us with ſuperſtition and uncharitableneſs, becauſe we will not admit all freely; as if there were no Meane between profaneſs and ſuperſtition, between charity and licentiouſneſs.

His ſecond inſtance for amplification, is from *Luk.* 5.31,32. (the quotation is miſtaken by his Printer, and the ſenſe by himſelf) wherein Chriſt is repreſented as a Phyſician onely of the ſick, and came to call, not the righteous, but ſinners.

Anſw. 1. What is this againſt us who make it our deſign to admit none but ſuch ſick ones and ſinners as Chriſt did?

2. It makes much againſt himſelf, if he will urge it in order to the Sacrament, ſince its evident Chriſt here makes a diſtinction and ſeparation; and 1. Would not have all admitted; and 2. In particular he rejects ſound and righteous ones, namely that were ſo in their own conceit, and ſuch were moſt of the Phariſees:

and do we ſuſpend any others then thoſe who are wiſer in their own eyes then ſeven men that can render a reaſon, and fitter for the Lords Supper (if themſelves may be judges) then the beſt of the approved or approvers?

*Pag.*22. His third inſtance is *John* 8. from the woman taken in adultery, accuſed by the Phariſees, but not condemned by our Saviour.

Anſw. 1. Doth this man take the Scripture for a noſe of wax, that he perverts it ſo groſly, either through ignorance, inſtability, or prejudice? (to ſay no worſe) what is this to our Sacramentall triall? The Phariſees came to trap Chriſt with a practicall caſe and a civill caſe, *John* 8. 5,6. Had Chriſt bid them ſtone her, he had been accuſed to the Romans as ſtirring the Jews up to act the ſupreme power which was taken from them by the Romans; ſee *John* 18. 31. Had he forbid them to ſtone her, he had been ſlandered to the Jews, as an enemy to, and contradictor of the Law of *Moſes*. Our Saviour at firſt waves anſwering to ſo captious a queſtion, *ver.*6. But when that would not ſatisfie their malicious importunity, he gives them ſo

wiſe

wiſe an anſwer, as 1: He avoyded both extreams; and 2. He caught them who came to catch him; And for the woman, though he condemn not her perſon either to civill death, as being no civill Judge, *Luk.* 12.14. nor eternally, as not coming (in the ſtate of humiliation) to deſtroy, but to ſave, *Luk.* 9.56. *John* 12.47. yet he condemns her ſin, and gives her good counſel, *John* 8.11. What is this to our keeping perſons viſibly unworthy from the Sacrament, and that by juſt authority in a publick and judiciall way? I wonder this man doth not now condemn the civill Magiſtrate for executing adulterers, inceſtuous perſons, Sodomites, &c. which Chriſt and his Apoſtles would not, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1,6,9,11. onely they judged them ſpiritually, ſhewed them the danger of thoſe ſins, and Gods mercy in pardoning and purging them. Are not many juſtly cut off both by the Civill and Eccleſiaſticall Sword, whom yet Chriſt, as abſolute Lord of life and death, may pardon? Shall not man do juſtice, becauſe Chriſt ſhews mercy? Had this woman been ſtoned to death, had that been any barre to Chriſts Pardon? The moſt righteous Judge in the world is confcious of the

ſeeds of inceſt, murder, &c. in himſelf, ſhall he not therefore condemn ſuch perſons legally convicted before him? The moſt pious Miniſter or Church Officer is conſcious of the like, ſhall he not therefore either ſuſpend or excommunicate ſuch perſons, when legally convented and convicted upon juſt triall? *David* himſelf was actually guilty both of murder and adultery, was it ever after unlawfull for him as a King and Judge, to condemn ſuch perſons? Indeed the conſciouſneſs of our own weakneſs and guilt, ſhould make us put forth ſuch acts with abundance of ſelf-reflection and pity to ſuch offenders, but hath not the leaſt ſhew of warrant to root up or make void the power of triall and judgement, either in Church or State. Fooliſh pitty mars a City in this caſe, ſhall the woolf be ſpared to worry the ſheep? If ſuch pity be not the greateſt cruelty both to ſoul and body, I know not what is.

Pag. 22. *His fourth reaſon ariſes from the vanity, formality, and impoſſibility of ſelecting people to this Ordinance. For put the caſe you will have a gathered company, I pray whom do you account to be fit and worthy receivers? if not all that make profeſſion*

ſeſſion as we do mixtly, then thoſe only that have an intereſt in Chriſt, and are true Believers. Well, but how will you be able to know them? The heart of man is deceitfull above all things, who can know it? And if we can hardly diſcover our own hearts, how ſhall we ever diſcern others? So that all will come but to thoſe that have the faireſt ſhew, thoſe that ſeem ſuch; and you cannot be ſecured but there may be and will be ſome hypocrites; and ſo this true partaking, as all one body and one blood, in ſuch a mixt communion as you pretend, vaniſhes, and there can be no ſuch matter. But now if men here ſtand upon a formall purity, and will have the outward pureſt Church they can, they go to ſeparating again (as we have daily teſtimony) till they are quite ſeparated one from another; even as in the peeling of an onyon, where you may peel and peel till you have brought all to nothing, unleſs to a few teares perchance, with which the eyes of good men muſt needs run over in the doing.

Anſw. 1. Here Mr. *Humphrey* thinks he hath us faſt: But let me intreat him not to boaſt before he put off his harneſs. And that both himſelf and others may ſee how wide he roves from the mark,

we shall deny both his Extreams, and tell him that neither bare profession on the one hand, nor truth of grace on the other hand, is the rule we walk by in admitting persons to the Sacrament, if considered *quatenus*. Could not all the art Mr. *Humphrey* hath, think of *medium participationis*, between these two extreams, which will do very good service for his conviction and our justification?

1. Therefore let him know, that we look at his rule of bare profession, as a very loose principle, which will open a door not onely for the wickedest varlets, as murderers, &c. but also for children and fools, contrary to his own principles, now in print. And indeed, if bare profession were enough to warrant admission to the Sacrament, how dares Mr. *Humphrey* excommunicate any baptized person, though he be the wickedest villain that ever *Tyburn* groaned for, since even the worst of them are professors, as well as the truest *Nathanael*? Therefore say we, Profession, if joyned with sufficiency of knowledge in fundamentals, and sutable practice in conversation, at least negatively, that there be no evidence against a person, as living after

after conviction in a known ſin; this is the rule we walk by in admiſſion to the Sacraments; though withall, we do not neglect inquiry after truth of grace, ſo far as may ſtand with charity.

2. Let him and the world know, that truth of grace in the heart on the other hand is not our rule of admitting to the Lords Supper. The reaſon is, becauſe we cannot admit divers perſons, though we ſhould infallibly know they had truth of grace; as 1. Children and fools, divers of whom undoubtedly have truth of grace in their hearts; and that becauſe they cannot examine themſelves, nor diſcern the Lords body according to the rule of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28, 29. Nor 2. Such, who though they have truth of grace, yet fall into ſome foul and ſcandalous ſin, for which they deſerve excommunication it ſelf, and much more ſuſpenſion, which is but an inferiour degree of excommunication. As truth of grace cannot excuſe a man from death, if he be a murderer, &c. ſo neither can it excuſe him from Church Cenſures, if he be foully ſcandalous, eſpecially if wilfull; which yet for a time may ſtand with truth of grace, witneſs *Aſa*, 2 *Chr.* 16.

16.10,12. Doth not Mr. *Humphrey* know that a perſon habitually worthy may be actually unworthy? or that a perſon inviſibly unworthy may be viſibly worthy; and *contra*? Did he never hear of the worthineſs of perſon and the worthineſs of preparation, viſible worthineſs and reall worthineſs? Reall and compleat worthineſs (I mean as to its parts, when a perſon hath grace and in ſome meaſure of truth labours to fit himſelf) is onely known to God: outward or viſible worthineſs may be known to man by due ſearch and triall, accompanied with charity and prudence, in which better to fail on the right hand then on the left; and where we ſee competent knowledge and have nothing to object againſt a mans converſation, the perſon profeſſing his univerſall ſubjection to Chriſt, and deſire to receive for his further edification, the Elderſhip ought to give ſuch a one the right hand of fellowſhip. And ſhould he afterwards be uncaſed, the ſame power of the Keyes which admitted him, can either ſuſpend or excommunicate him, according to the demerit of his carriage.

And whereas he objects, That do what we

we can, hypocrites will creep in: That we eaſily grant, but its nothing to his purpoſe, ſince not hypocrites ſimply, but hypocrites as uncaſed, or godly men as groſſly extravagant, are the object of Church Cenſures. The beſt uſe therefore can be made of his peel'd onyon, is to draw tears from his own and others eyes for theſe extravagant diſcourſes of his, whereby he hath (as much as in him lies) troubled the Church, hindred Reformation, ſtrengthened the hands of the wicked, and ſadned the hearts of the righteous, whom God hath not made ſad, *Ezek.*13.22. Had we the peeling of his onyon, we would take off onely the skin, and make good uſe of the pulp, either for food, ſauce, or medicine. And ſo much good do him with his Onyon, whether he feed upon it, or weep over it.

Pag.23. *His fifth reaſon he gathers from the uniformity of the ſervice of God. If all other Worſhip lies in common, it is an inrenchment upon the common liberty, to put an encloſure upon the Sacrament.*

Anſw. 1. Let him anſwer himſelf; if all other worſhip lie in common(for this I ſuppoſe he means by uniformity) for children and diſtracted perſons (unleſs they trouble

trouble the Congregation) why doth Mr. *H.* encloſe the Lords Supper from them? Let him extricate himſelf, and then ſee if we come not out at the ſame gap. Where hath Chriſt *in terminis* forbid children and diſtracted perſons to receive? If Mr. *H.* can exclude them by conſequence, the ſame or like conſequence will ſerve us to exclude divers far more unfit to receive then either of them.

2. Muſt all Divine Service be laid in common, becauſe moſt parts of it are? Why then not all time, becauſe ſix parts of time are ſo? why not all places and perſons, becauſe many are? Let us bleſs God ſo much of his Service lies in common, and not quarrell that all lies not in common, ſince the beſt are unworthy that any part of Gods Worſhip ſhould lie in common.

3. There is no part of Gods Worſhip ſo encloſed, but all perſons of age and diſcretion may injoy it, if the fault be not their own, and that upon very honourable and equall, yea eaſie conditions.

4. As in every Ordinance ſome part is in common, ſome part incloſed, ſo is it

it in the Sacrament. In every Ordinance a great part of the Letter is common to all, the ſpirit of it is incloſed. In prayer I can bleſs God for truth of grace wrought in ſome, but can I without lying praiſe him for true grace wrought in all? In preaching the Miniſter ought to apply ſome commands univerſally, others to ſuch and ſuch ſtates, conditions, and ſexes; threatnings to obſtinate ſinners, promiſes to the penitent, &c. Is not here a plain incloſure? If all parts of prayer or preaching be not applicable to all, ſhall all parts of the Sacrament be applicable to all? We deny not but all may be preſent at the exhortation, conſecration, adminiſtration; but the queſtion is, Whether all may actually receive, and whether the ſeal may be applied to them to whom the Covenant of grace *in ſtatu quo* is viſibly inapplicable.

Hereby alſo will appear the weakneſs of what he adds by way of amplification, *Are all the commands of God univerſall? why not (Do this) alſo?*

Anſw. 1. Many commands of God are not univerſall, as was ſhewed before; and why then may not this be of that number?

2. If

2. If this command of actuall receiving be univerſall, why doth himſelf limit it by excluding ſome perſons?

3. Then it were a ſin for the Miniſter or any other to perſwade any to forbear the Sacrament, though he came with his hands imbrewed in blood, or actually drunk, or played the part of *Zimri* or *Cosby* in the face of the Congregation immediately before the Sacrament: For neither can my wickedneſs, nor the perſwaſion of any creature, looſe the bands of an univerſall command. Were I certain this were Mr. *H.* his judgement, as I have ground to ſuſpect from what he delivers *pag.*7. haply I might ſay more to him, but till then I ſhall forbear.

What further he objects is truth, *That an unregenerate man ſins in every ſervice and duty, yet muſt not thereupon plead a* quietus eſt *from ſervice:* but there is not *par ratio* in order to receiving, 1. Becauſe its not every mans duty to receive. 2, Becauſe other duties, though ſinfully by him performed (inſtance particularly in hearing the Word preached) may be means of his converſion, not ſo the Sacrament unworthily received; of which more hereafter.

In

In the ſame Page he throws his glove, firſt to the Independents, then to the Presbyterians. To the former in theſe words:

Let our Independents anſwer, Why do you allow a Syntax *in the whole Service of God beſides, and bring in a* Quæ genus *of Anomala's and Heteroclites onely at this Ordinance?*

Anſ. 1. The Independents are much beholding to him for his favourable opinion of them, as good Proficients in Chriſts School. They are good Grammarians indeed, if they have perfected the Chriſtian Grammar ſo, as to leave in it but one *Anomalum* or *Heteroclite.*

2. I think its rather *optandum* then *credendum*, that they allow a *Syntaxis* in the whole Service of God beſides.

3. Yet as to free admiſſion in order unto preſence at all Ordinances, I beleeve they (as well as we) allow a *ſyntax* in the whole worſhip of God.

4. Heteroclites and Anomala's are no more abſurd in Worſhip, then they are in Grammar. As no rule in Grammar but hath its exception, ſo no part of Worſhip but hath its incloſure. Of which afterwards.

And

And therefore though I cannot juſtifie any of the Independents in ſeparating from our Congregations, yet if in excluding from the Lords Supper perſons viſibly unworthy, they act upon the ſame principles with us; in ſo doing, though *they bring in a* Quæ genus *of Anomalaes and Heteroclites at the Lords Supper*, yet they violate not the *Syntax* of Divine Worſhip. If they walk by other rules or principles not warranted, let them plead for themſelves, I am not of their Counſell.

But for his challenge to the Presbyterians (or at leaſt ſome of them) *How we can admit of children as Members of the viſible Church (being born of Chriſtian Parents) unto Baptiſme, and yet turn away the Parents of thoſe children from the Sacrament? Thoſe that have gone about to anſwer this, had better haply have ſaid nothing: for our free courſe of Baptiſme and a deniall of this, is ſuch a ſeam-rent as will never be handſomely drawn up, though ſtitcht together. Nevertheleſs in yeelding the one, they have granted the other.*

Anſw. 1. How can Mr. *H.* admit the children themſelves to Baptiſme, and yet deny them the Lords Supper? If herein he

he act by faith, let him ſhew a Divine Precept by which he excludes them. If he bring a proof by conſequence, let him conſider if that or a like conſequence will not exclude others (as well as children) for whom he keeps the door open.

2. How can himſelf admit children to Baptiſme, and yet excludes their parents from the Lords Supper? If the parents of a child baptized be either diſtracted or excommunicated, Mr. *H.* being Judge, they ought not to be admitted to the Lords Supper; whereby its apparent, that even in Mr. *H.* his judgement, the childes baptiſme is no neceſſary medium to prove the Parents muſt be admitted to the Lords Supper; which yet he urgeth againſt us, but forgets how he wounds himſelf with the ſame weapon.

3. To come cloſer to the Objection; two things by way of anſwer are very conſiderable, 1. That we clear and juſtifie the promiſcuous baptizing of children of Chriſtian Parents, be the Parents themſelves never ſo unworthy. 2. That the promiſcuous admiſſion of children to Baptiſme, is no ground for the promiſcuous admiſſion of their parents to the Lords Supper.

For the firſt of theſe: We admit children to Baptiſme, 1. By vertue of their remote parents, who may be good though their immediate parents be bad, Acts 2.39. *The promiſe is made to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off*, &c. To your children indefinitely, not to your next children onely. Which is yet more evident by comparing *Levit.*26.45. & *Micah*7.20. where the Covenant of Anceſtors and Parents extends to the children for many generations, till the children themſelves in perſon renounce the Covenant. This alſo is hinted in the Text under the notion *of them that are afar off*, which is extendable not only to remoteneſs of place or of ſtate, but alſo to remoteneſs of time; that is, as *Beza* notes, to your children in remote ages to come, *Omnibus longè poſt futuris.* Nor is it in the Originall τοῖς μακρὰν, but τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν. The Gentiles were οἱ μακρὰν, *Epheſ.*2.17. and ſo oppoſed to οἱ ἐγγὺς; but future generations are οἱ εἰς μακράν. In this particular, mercy triumphs over juſtice, in that God who puniſhes the parents ſin to the fourth generation, extends Covenant-mercy to a thouſand generations,

Exod.

*Exod.*20. *ver.*5,6. Nor was *Peters* design here to foretell the calling of the Gentiles, but to incourage his Auditors to faith and repentance; since (as *Beza* well notes upon the place) the myſtery of the Gentiles votation was not yet known to *Peter* himſelf, nor was expedient to be revealed to theſe new Converts, had he known it never ſo well. As the Covenant of *Adam*, ſo the Covenant of *Abraham*; as the Covenant of Works, ſo the Covenant of Grace is extendible to many generations: and where the root is holy, there not only the immediate, but alſo the moſt remote branches are federally holy, *Rom.* 11. 16. and that whether the branches be naturall or ingrafted, *ver.*17.

2. Children may be admitted by ſtipulation of others to ſee them educated in the faith into which they are baptized, be the parents themſelves never ſo wicked, yea excommunicated, yea Papiſts, and thus baſtards and foundlings may be baptized. See *Ameſius* his Caſes, *lib.*4. *cap.* 27. Nay upon this account divers learned men very probably conceive, that even Heathen children may be baptized, if once taken into a Chriſtian

Family, where the Governour or Governours undertake for their Chriſtian education, and they are out of the power of their Heathen parents; for by being members of a Chriſtian Family, they are made members of the viſible Church, as civill, though not naturall children of Chriſtians. I am ſure this Doctrine is conſonant to the Analogy of Circumciſion, *Geneſ.*17.12. where not onely the childe born in the houſe, but alſo bought with money, was to be circumciſed, yea bought of ſtrangers, and not of the ſeed of *Abraham*, as is expreſs and evident in the Text. Thus an Heathen born in the houſe, or bought with money might eat of the holy things, *Levit.*22.11.

3. There is ſomething conſiderable in the immediate parents, which makes their children capable of Baptiſme; and 1. Though they tranſgreſs, yet they do not renounce the Covenant (as Turks do.) 2. They are Members of the viſible Church till excommunicated, and why may not the children be admitted to the ſame priviledge the parents yet injoy? provided their tender age be capable of that priviledge; and children are as capable

pable of Baptiſme as they were of Circumciſion, both being paſſive Ordinances.

The ſecond thing to be cleared is, That the promiſcuous admiſſion of children to Baptiſme, is no ground for the promiſcuous admiſſion of their parents to the Lords Supper. This is evident, 1. Becauſe more is required to make a perſon capable of the Lords Supper, then an Infant capable of Baptiſme.

2. Perſonall unworthineſs may eaſily appear in the parent, which cannot appear in the Infant.

3. It is not ſimple membership gives an immediate right to the Lords Supper: and therefore though the parents membership do regularly make the childe capable of Church membership (and ſo give it a right to Baptiſme) yet neither his own nor his childes Church membership can make the parent capable of the Lords Supper, a priviledge not for every Church member, but for a viſibly worthy Church member. Suppoſe the ſame perſon (*Timothy* for inſtance) baptized regularly in his riper years, yea and admitted to the Lords Supper alſo, as viſibly worthy: afterwards he walks ſcandalouſly; he is

1. Admoniſhed. 2. Suſpended. 3. If perſiſting obſtinate, diſmembred. I beſeech you what irregular proceeding is here?

4. Therefore if the promiſcuous admiſſion of children to Baptiſme is no ground for their own promiſcuous admiſſion to the Lords Supper, much leſs is the promiſcuous admiſſion of children to Baptiſme, any ground of their parents promiſcuous admiſſion to the Lords Supper. The parent gives to his child what himſelf hath, namely Church membership, but cannot thence claim what is the priviledge of a worthy Church member, namely Sacramentall Communion. The ſon of a Jew or Proſelyte (being clean) might eat of the Paſſeover, when at the ſame time the father (in whoſe right the childe was circumciſed) being unclean, might not partake of that Sacrament. A Prieſts ſon or daughter might in their fathers right (being clean) eat of the holy things: when at the ſame time the father himſelf (being unclean) was forbid to eat of them. Compare *Levit.* 10. 14. *Numb.* 18. 11. & *Levit.* 22. 4,6. There is *par ratio* of morall pollutions. A wicked parent who deſerves the higheſt degree of excommunication, yet being

a

a Church member, his childe ſhall be baptized in his right, and by Baptiſme be ſolemnly admitted into the priviledge of Church memberſhip, which yet the father injoyes; when at the ſame time the father ſhall be debarred the priviledge of a worthy Church member; namely, Sacramentall communion at the Lords Table. The parents fœderall holineſs ſhall benefit his childe at the very ſame time when his antifœderall wickedneſs ſhall prejudice himſelf.

There is then no ſeamrent in our practices or principles, unleſs it be in Mr. *H.* his brain, which if we can neither draw nor ſtitch, well may it be our ſorrow, but we truſt it ſhall never be our ſin.

In his third Edition, *pag.* 25. he makes an addition to fortifie his fifth reaſon, by impeaching us, *That by urging our forms as neceſſary, We violate a branch of Chriſtian liberty, equalizing Ordinances of men,* Col. 2. 18, 20. *with Divine Ordinances; which humane Ordinances, though We might ſubmit to as prudentiall onely, yet he dares not ſuffer them to creep into the ſeat of God, namely conſcience. Its ill putting Gods Worſhip upon ſtilts, leſt by ſeeking to advance it higher, We give it a fall into*

dangerous ſcruples and diviſions.

Anſw. 1. Let the Reader take notice that (in Mr. *H.* his judgement) the putting of a barre to free admiſſion is an humane, not a Divine Ordinance. Could we be of his faith, we would be more againſt this barre then himſelf is. We bleſs God that an humane Ordinance doth civilly or eccleſiaſtically back a Divine Ordinance, but like not the preſſing of humane inventions upon conſcience, eſpecially in Divine Worſhip.

2. We ask him, whether his excluding of Infants and diſtracted perſons, be a Divine Ordinance? If ſo, let us ſee his patent out of Scripture either in tearms or by conſequence; and if the very ſame or a like Divine Patent do not exclude all perſons viſibly unworthy, we ſhall be of Mr. *H.* his Religion, to admit all pell mell.

3. Suppoſing the barre to free admiſſion had been only a prudentiall humane Ordinance, I ſay Mr. *Humphrey* had done God and the Church more ſervice in ſubmitting to it, then in diſputing againſt it; ſince 1. As a prudentiall it is not againſt the rule of Scripture. 2. And therefore might by conſequence be deduced from

from Scripture, as a thing 1. Lawfull. 2. Expedient. 3. Commanded by lawfull authority, Civill and Eccleſiaſticall, yea in the very times of the Prelates. And if the lawfull commands of Superiours (*cæteris paribus*) be not obligatory to conſcience, let Mr. *H.* raſe out the fifth Commandment.

4. We put Gods Worſhip no more upon ſtilts then himſelf doth, excluding onely perſons that are viſibly uncapable of the Lords Supper; and if diſtracted perſons are uncapable in his judgement, ſcandalous perſons are more uncapable in our judgement. Therefore in his Rejoynder let him either juſtifie us, or condemn himſelf.

His ſixth and laſt Argument is drawn from his innocency in free admiſſion, and that upon a ſixfold account: 1. *Becauſe therein he doth but his duty.*

Anſw. This is but *petitio principii*, the main thing to be proved, eſpecially if he lay it down as a generall rule for all Miniſters.

2. *Becauſe he hath no power to turn away any.*

Anſw. I take this for one of the trueſt paſſages in all his book, upon ſuppoſition that

that he hath no Presbytery ſettled in his Congregation. But little doth Mr. *H.* conſider how this conceſſion makes againſt himſelf, and ſubverts a main argument of his, drawn from the example of *Judas*: For ſuppoſing him to have been viſibly unworthy, yet ſay we, Chriſt as a Miniſter had no juridicall power to turn him or any other away, ſince he could not legally be both Judge and Witneſs; and there being then no Presbytery conſtituted to try unworthy Receivers by. Which alſo at this day is the caſe of moſt Pariſhes in *England*. And for my own part, I much doubt whether a Miniſter by his own power can exclude any Church member from the Sacrament.

3. Becauſe *he hopes the beſt of all.*

Anſw. 1. So did the Angel of *Epheſus*, who yet tried and uncaſed the falſe Apoſtles, *Rev.*2.2,4. 2. So did the Apoſtle *Paul*, who yet commanded Chriſtians to mark and avoid unworthy Church members, *Rom.*16.17. & 1 *Cor.*5.11. & 2 *Theſſ.* 3.14,15. 3. So muſt Magiſtrates, yet I hope they may and do condemn Malefactors. 4. If this be a good argument, may not Mr. *H.* as well conclude, I hope the beſt of all, therefore I will excommunicate

municate none. Though charity hope the beſt, yet it is not ſtark blinde; and I think its no mean point of charity to prevent the ruine of many poor ſoules, who ruſh on headlong to contract the guilt of the Body and Blood of the Lord.

4. Becauſe *he knows God can turn even the worſt at this Ordinance if he pleaſe.*

Anſw. 1. Suppoſe a ſcandalous Profeſſor actually converted by the preceding exerciſes at the Sacrament, this is not ground enough for the Church to permit him at that time to receive, ſince the rule they walk by is viſible worthineſs. 2. The queſtion is not what abſolutely God can do, but what God doth or hath undertaken to do. Let Mr. *H.* ſhew one promiſe or preſident for ſo much as one perſon coming to the Lords Supper in the ſtate of nature, and converted by it or at it. 3. Whatever any may be by the exhortation, &c. at the Sacrament, yet the main queſtion is, Whether any be converted by actuall receiving the outward Elements, who immediately before receiving was unconverted. A promiſe or preſident in this kinde will be much to the purpoſe; but till then, we muſt crave pardon if we hold not

not free admission in order to participation, though we shall not deny free admission in order to universall presence at the whole Service. Prove actuall receiving a converting Ordinance, and we shall be as zealous for free admission as Mr. *H.* can be.

5. *Because he endeavours his utmost* de jure *that all come prepared.*

Answ. 1. So high a commendation were fitter to come out of any mans mouth then Mr. *H. Prov.* 22. 7. 2. Its a commendation too high for any mortall. 3. I shall be bold to tell him, that in this self *Encomium* he speaks falsly. Did ever any meer man since the fall indeavour his utmost *de jure* that all his Flock might be worthy receivers (such are all that come prepared.) Doth he not know that one worthy in Christs account, must 1. Be converted. 2. Unblameable, yea exemplary in his conversation. 3. Actually prepared, by exciting and acting the Sacramentall graces? And hath Mr. *H.* indeavoured his utmost *de jure* that all his people should be such? nay, hath he indeavoured his utmost *de jure* that himself may be such? Did he never since he was a Minister fail (through careleſnes,

yea

yea wilfulneſs ſometimes) in praying for his people, in preaching, in example, in private reproof, admonition, encouragement, triall? &c. Is he without ſins of weakneſs, careleſneſs, yea ſometimes wilfulneſs as a Miniſter? and dares he cry at Chriſts Barre (as he boaſts in his Book) *That he hath endeavoured his utmoſt* de jure *that all come prepared?* If this ſmell not ſtrong of ſublime Phariſaiſme, *Luk.*18.11,12. I beſeech you what doth? You ſaw his pride formerly in cenſuring others, and very many far his betters, mark now how the bladder ſwells with ſelf conceit and applauſe. The Lord help him to ſee the beam in his own eye, who is ſo quickſighted to eſpy a moat in his Brothers eye.

Its well therefore that in his laſt and third Edition he begins in part to cry *peccavi, pag.*26. in theſe words: *This I ſuppoſe, but wo is me if I juſtifie my ſelf, who am a man of unclean lips, and dwell in the midſt of a people of unclean lips, eminent onely in our failings.*

Anſ. 1. It ſeems then this proud and confident aſſertion proves at laſt (by his own grant) but a ſuppoſition. 2. Suppoſitions, though falſe, may be grounds of truth,

truth, but false suppositions asserted (as here) are many times dangerous and pernicious untruths. 3. For any to assert he hath endeavoured his utmost *de jure* in a course or series of actions, is a most dangerous falshood both for the Assertor and the receivers. 4. That his own conscience checkt him for this proud and false assertion, is apparent by those expressions, *But wo is me if I justifie my self*, &c. Yet what higher self justification can there be, then to stand upon tiptoes with God, and say, I have endeavoured my utmost *de jure*? A godly man may in humility and sincerity use the words of the Pharisee, *I thank thee O God, I am not like other men.* But what godly man dares say to God, I have endeavoured my utmost *de jure*? The Lord give him grace fully and publickly to retract, and not to mince or excuse his pride in this particular, lest God one day shew him to his cost the vanity of his former assertion and latter supposition, and he be found in the number of those righteous ones, who need no repentance or pardon, *Matth.*3.13. *Luk.*15.7.

6. *He humbly confesseth all their and his own sins (as* Hezekiah*) desiring true repentance,*

repentance, and a pardon for all his and their omiſſions.

Anſw. 1. If here he ſpeak really, and confeſs and beg pardon for his Miniſteriall as well as perſonall omiſſions, I cannot but approve it as an act of humility after his former vaunting. But then note how he contradicts his former proud aſſertion (I wiſh his book and heart too were fuller of ſuch contradictions, both for his own and his peoples ſake.) If he have done his utmoſt *de jure*, what need he deſire pardon for his omiſſions? If he be guilty of too many omiſſions, how hath he endeavoured his utmoſt *de jure?*

2. Will confeſſion of our own and others ſins ſerve the turn, without proportionable indeavour to reform our ſelves and others in our places? What is this but to lye in the ditch and cry God help us? And if the unworthieſt may enjoy the priviledges of themoſt penitent and humble Chriſtians, is this like to reform, or to harden them, as if they were as good as the beſt? Should a Phyſician thus venture the iſſue upon God, and give phyſick that might kill as well as cure, I think no wiſe man would judge it an act of faith, but of high preſumption.

on. Should any onely give warning of danger, and not labour actually what he could to prevent it, all his warning will not quit him of murder before God. Is crying after a wandring ſheep enough to ſave it out of the pit? the Apoſtle *Jude* ſure was of another minde, *Jude verſ.*23. *pulling them out of the fire.*

3. What doth he in his confeſſion and prayer for pardon, more then we do, be Communicants either really or viſibly never ſo worthy in an Evangelicall ſenſe? onely here we go beyond him in our actuall care and indeavour to fit all ſorts for the Sacrament by perſonall and particular examination, counſell and prayer, which he doth not: yet he thinks he hath indeavoured his utmoſt *de jure*; we, though we do far more then Mr. *H.* are aſſured we fall very ſhort of doing or indeavouring our utmoſt *de jure*, and believe that the beſt Miniſter under heaven never yet indeavoured his utmoſt *de jure* to fit his people for the Lords Supper. Upon all which accounts well weighed, I believe Mr. *H.* hath little cauſe to boaſt of his innocency, or bring that for an argument to juſtifie his free admiſſion, as he doth *pag.*25.

Two

Two other conſiderations he is pleaſed to adde *ex abundanti*: the firſt drawn *from the command and good of coming, p.* 25.

For the Command, I ask, Where doth Chriſt command all to receive? If it be urged, He bid all the Apoſtles to receive,

An. Were there no other Church members but the Apoſtles? what thinks he of *Mark*, *Luke*, *Nathanael*, and many other Diſciples that received not?

I, but he bid all preſent to receive, yea *Judas* himſelf.

Anſ. 1. Suppoſing *Judas* were preſent, he as well as the reſt being an eminent profeſſor. 2. A very knowing perſon. 3. Not legally convinced of ſcandall, I ſee not how he could have been denied the Sacrament.

I, but the Apoſtle bids all members of the Church of *Corinth* come and receive.

Anſ. 1. Let him ſhew that alſo if he can from the Text, 1 *Cor.* 11. 2. I am ſure he convinces and threatens all that come unworthily, but I ſee not where he commands all to receive abſolutely. 3. Why ſhould Mr. *H.* or any put thoſe aſunder which God hath joyned together; namely, examination and receiving. The Apoſtle 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. ſaies, *Let a man exa-*

mine himſelf, and ſo let him eat; Mr. *H.* ſaies, Let a man eat though he do not examine himſelf.

Object. Upon this account a naturall man alſo ſhould not attend the Word preached, ſince he cannot hear it worthily before converſion.

Anſw. Not ſo, the Word is the inſtrument of converſion, ſo not the Sacrament, therefore naturall men as well as others muſt hear that, but may not receive this. And this leads me to anſwer the other branch of his firſt Argument drawn from *the good of coming, becauſe its a means by which they who want grace may receive it*, &c.

Anſw. 1. An Ordinance may be a means of grace in order either to converſion or edification. In order to converſion we deny that actuall receiving is a means of grace: In order to edification, we acknowledge it to be a ſingular means of grace to the worthy receiver; but what is this to Mr. *H.* his purpoſe?

If he ſay, The Word and Prayer in order to conſecration may convert.

Anſw. That we deny not, and therefore here permit a freer admiſſion then M. *H.* namely, both for children, diſtracted.

cted and excommunicated perſons to attend the Sacrament; but not actually to receive till they be actually capable as perſons viſibly worthy.

2. Want of grace is either graduall and ſenſible, or totall and inſenſible. The Sacrament (as before) is an eſpeciall means of grace for the former, but not for the latter. But this will come hereafter to be diſputed in its proper place, which makes me here to paſs it over only with a touch. By the way let the Reader obſerve theſe words of Mr. *H.* pag. 26.

Though we may ſcruple how an unregenerate man can receive it as a pledge, yet as it is a means whereby grace is conveyed, there is no difficulty.

Doth not the former branch juſtifie what hath formerly been proved, that the Lords Supper being a ſpeciall pledge of grace, may not be applied to one viſibly unworthy? and where is Mr. *H.* then (himſelf being judge) if we prove its no means of grace in order to converſion? But that work I ſhall ſuſpend till I come to clear the grand objection about the converting power of the Sacrament.

His laſt ſupernumerary Argument is

drawn from *the evil of omiſſion, ibid.* This he confirms from the parallel neglect of Circumciſion and the Paſſeover, of which whoſoever were guilty *Were in danger to be cut off.*

An. There's a wide difference between not receiving and neglecting of the Sacrament; the latter is a great ſin, ſo not the former. Nor doth that man, who being convinced of his preſent unfitneſs, forbeares receiving, ſin as a neglector, but rather ſhews his high reſpect of the Sacrament.

For his inſtance from *Matth.* 22. it hath been anſwered already. Only where now he adds, *That thoſe which came not to the Feaſt were deſtroyed.*

Anſw. In that he goes beyond the Text, which ſaies indeed, that they who murthered his ſervants were deſtroyed; not ſo of the reſt, but onely that they were excluded the Supper. And though it be a truth by conſequence they were deſtroyed, as being judicially deprived of Chriſt and of his grace, yet that makes not for, but againſt Mr. *Humphrey*, and ſhews clearly that by that Marriage Feaſt is not meant the Lords Supper, there being many ſaved who never taſte of

of the Lords Supper, but none can be ſaved who taſte not of the Marriage Feaſt.

Whereas therefore he adds in the ſame Paragraph, *They are moſt unworthy of all who come not in to the Supper.*

Anſw. 1. It will not hold water on either hand, ſince 1. Thoſe who murdered the Servants that invited them were more unworthy. 2. If we may judge by the penalty, he that came without the Wedding Garment was more unworthy, the neglecters being for preſent onely deprived of the Supper, but he bound hand and foot and caſt into utter darkneſs, *Matthew* 22. 13. 2. Dare Maſter *Humphrey* ſay they are unworthy who come not alwaies to the Lords Supper? May not ſome ſcruple of conſcience, yea ſometimes worldly occaſions, juſtly excuſe a perſon for not coming? But I am ſure he that comes not to the Marriage Feaſt is alwaies unworthy; another clear evidence that by the Marriage Feaſt is not meant the Lords Supper.

To draw then to a cloſe of our anſwer to his firſt part, In oppoſition to Mr. *H.* his aſſertion, *pag.* 26, Its neither a certain

duty on the Miniſters part to admit all, nor on the peoples part for all to receive, unleſs you underſtand it *mediately*, as the getting of aſſurance is a duty lies upon all, yet not immediately, but firſt they muſt get true grace, the ground of aſſurance. So all muſt come to the Sacrament; true, but firſt they muſt be prepared. All muſt be admitted to receive; true, but firſt they muſt be viſibly worthy. We keep not any away *for fear of accidentall ſcandall, or of committing an uncertain ſin, in the doing*, as Mr. *H.* would make the world believe *pag.* 26. (I ſpeak as to the rule we walk by, for what particular men upon occaſion may do through weakneſs or otherwiſe, I am no Patron of that) but to prevent certain ſcandall by the admiſſion of perſons viſibly unworthy, as alſo the ſin and ruine of unworthy receivers, who being admitted, would murder Chriſt, and eat and drink judgement to themſelves; as alſo our own partaking with other mens ſins, and being acceſſary to the ruine of their poor ſouls: from all which guilt I beſeech the Lord to free Mr. *Humphrey*, and others of his minde and practice, who by this looſe principle of free admiſſion, &c. have laid

laid the axe to the root of reformation. And whereas he is pleaſed to charge us in a rhetoricall way, *as doing evil* (by ſuſpending from the Sacrament) *that good may come of it, and that therefore our damnation is juſt*, We ſhall make no other return but this, to beſeech God to forgive him, as we heartily do, this bitter ſpirit of cenſoriouſneſs.

Whatever therefore he may think of the childe of his own begetting, as appears by that expreſſion in the foot of the ſame Page, *I will not give you my reaſons by the heap, but by the weight*, I leave it to the indifferent Readers judgement, whether Mr. *H.* be not better at number then at weight. For my own part, I conceive that one good argument (which makes no number) would have weighed far more in the ballance of the Sanctuary, and of ſolid reaſon, then all his eight arguments heaped up together.

I like his caution in the cloſe, *That no man take occaſion from hence to preſume*; but I fear one ſingle caution will not be able either to prevent or redreſs the Tythe of that miſchief which is in part already and every day will be more and more wrought by his eight Arguments.

And here I ſhould lay down my weapons, but that I perceive he is reſolved upon a skirmiſh after the pitcht battell. Haply he may be better at ἀνασκευὴ then he hath been at κατασκευή. Too many in our daies are better at pulling down then at building up; I ſhall make bold to try whether Mr. *H.* be of the number. Nor ſhall I blame him if he pull down onely rotten houſes, provided he hurt not himſelf or his neighbours by their downfall.

The ſecond part anſwered.

PAſſing his premonitory Preface, I come directly to his Objections & Anſwers.

Obj. 1. *The Doctrine of free admiſſion will take away the uſe of the keyes, excommunicate Excommunication, and leave us no Diſcipline in the Church.*

This Objection I conceive Mr. *H.* might have ſpared, there being no great ſtrength in it againſt free admiſſion, in his ſenſe, which admits not excommunicated perſons.

Yet withall I muſt tell him, that his ſatisfaction of the objection is unſatisfactory, and not we, but himſelf will be found guilty of falſe ſurmiſes about Excommunication and Suſpenſion.

And

And here I value not what the Objection ſurmiſes, ſince Mr. *H.* may frame it as he pleaſe, and ſo make it ſurmiſe what he will: but if thereby he intends to inſinuate, that *we look at Church Diſcipline as lying ſolely in Suſpenſion*, I muſt tell him, he acts not the part of a fair reſpondent. 1. Therefore for negative Suſpenſion (which is a bare non-admiſſion) we account it no part of Church Diſcipline, no more then himſelf doth the non-admiſſion of Infants or mad folk. 2. For poſitive Suſpenſion (whereby 1. Perſons upon triall found unworthy by the Elderſhip. 2. Perſons who obſtinately refuſe triall, yet will obtrude themſelves upon the Sacrament, are by vote of the Elderſhip denied participation) this we ſay is an act of Church Diſcipline, and a leſſer degree of Excommunication, whereof I conceive there is a threefold degree, 1. From private communion, 2 *Theſſ.*3.14. 2. Not onely from private but alſo from Sacramentall Communion, 1 *Cor.*5.11. *Eating* there being extended to Sacramentall eating as well as domeſticall eating; as is cleared by the Antiquæriſt in his Vindication or Anſwer to *Suſpenſion ſuſpended*, to which therefore

I refer. 3. From Church membership, *Mat.*18.17,18. & 1 *Cor.*5.5.

Yet withall I adde, this poſitive ſuſpenſion is not iſſued out againſt any, unleſs by their obſtinacy they force the Elderſhip to it. For 1. if a perſon upon triall be found ignorant, the Elderſhip doth not preſently proceed to Suſpenſion, but intreat him to forbear a Sacrament or two, till he have attained to ſome competency of knowledge, in order whereunto they give him direction, and offer him their aſſiſtance. If for all this he thruſt himſelf upon the Sacrament, they deſire him to forbear, and tell him they dare not admit him till more capable. And laſtly, if all this will not ſerve, they are forced to iſſue out a Vote of Suſpenſion, which yet I believe is very rare, ſince too many ſuſpend themſelves by keeping away becauſe they will not be tried. 2. If a perſon be found ſcandalous, they admoniſh him being before them, if he profeſs repentance, and be willing to give ſatisfaction, they dare not refuſe him: otherwiſe they proceed with him as with the former after conviction. And if the ſin and ſcandall be great, and aggravated by obſtinacy,

cy, they proceed not onely to Suſpenſion, but alſo to diſmemberſhip. Having given this account of our judgement and practice, let us weigh Mr. *H.* his judgement about Church Cenſures.

*Pag.*31. He ſaith, *They are puniſhments upon ſcandalous perſons (after a legall conviction) whereby they are debarred from Chriſtian ſociety in generall.*

Anſw. 1. In this deſcription he ſurmiſes amiſs, by omitting one main end of Church Cenſures, namely the amendment of the party cenſured, 1 *Cor.*5.5.

2. In reſtrayning them onely to ſcandalous perſons as to practice, which are extendible to any wilfull ſinner; and if perſons wilfully ignorant be not wilfull ſinners, I know not who are, 2 *Pet.*3.5.

3. In debarring perſons cenſured of all Chriſtian ſociety in generall. And here I challenge Maſter *Humphrey* and all the world to ſhew me any one place in Scripture, which requires that perſons excommunicated ſhould not be preſent at any publick Ordinance. I grant, that by Excommunication they are made as Heathen and Publicanes, and are *in ſtatu quo* no Church members, *Matth.*18.17. but I ſee no place that proves perſons out of the

the Church may not be preſent at any publick Ordinance. I am ſure 1 *Corinth.* 14.24. favours the contrary. He is therefore much miſtaken about us, who neither ſhut the Church doores nor the Chancell doores againſt any perſon cenſured, but admit them to be preſent at all Ordinances; nor do we believe their preſence will leaven any, ſince ſpirituall defilement is not contracted by preſence, but by connivance or imitation, &c. And therefore if any gratifie profane perſons, it muſt be they who exclude from all Ordinances, not we who admit them to be preſent at all Ordinances, though we reſtrain them from actuall receiving, and that upon very weighty reaſons, yet withall let me tell Mr. *Humphrey* that he is miſtaken in ſaying, pag. 32. *That profane perſons never care to come to the Sacrament.* Did he never hear of poor ignorant and profane creatures, that muſt needs come and eat their Maker at *Eaſter* eſpecially? or is he onely a ſtranger in *Iſrael*, and knows not theſe things? May not ignorant and profane ones deſire the Sacrament partly out of cuſtome and faſhion, partly becauſe they apprehend its a diſgrace for them to be turned away, and

for

for many ſuch triviall grounds?

For his ſecond ſnrmiſe, pag. 32. *That Suſpenſion is inſtituted onely in reference to the Ordinances, to keep them pure and holy, as if the Sacrament eſpecially would be defiled otherwiſe to the Receivers.*

Anſw. 1. We think the Ordinances are defiled onely to thoſe who uſe them ſinfully. 2. That perſons are defiled not by preſence with unworthy Receivers, but by partaking in their ſins. 3. That they partake in the ſins of unworthy Receivers, who do not their duty to reform them, or to keep them from receiving in caſe they will not be reformed.

Its therefore falſe which he aſſerts, pag. 32. *That Church Cenſures concern not thoſe who are admitted to the Ordinances, but are uſed in reference onely to offendors,* &c.

For 1. It concerns all Church members in their places to look to it, that Church Cenſures be duly executed. 2. Their very execution doth much concern Church members, by fear to keep them from thoſe inordinate courſes which bring Church Cenſures upon others. And its conſiderable how he contradicts himſelf in the cloſe of this paragraph, when he makes ἀυθεσία, ἀποπλήρωσις &

ca-

παράδειγμα to be the ends of Church Censures. And I appeal to all the world, whether admonition (which better renders the sense of the first Greek word) satisfying the Congregation, and warning or example, concern more of the Congregation but the parties offending?

His third pretended surmise is, That we conceive *there is a most neer essentiall relation between this Excommunication and the Communion, as if it were a part of it, at least some necessary antecedent, as if the Sacrament could not be administred without it.*

Answ. 1. The Objection it self propounded *pag.* 30. and elevated to the height of Mr. *Humphrey* his design, infers no such mad consequence. For granting it were a truth, that free admission did take away the use of the Keyes, &c. how doth it follow from thence, that there is an essentiall relation between Excommunication and the Communion? or (which is more gross) that Excommunication is a part of the Communion? Do not *essentialiter relata* put or take away each other? but doth the taking away of Excommunication take away the Communion? what is this, but to conclude

conclude that the admitting of all ſorts to the Communion takes away the Communion? So belike there is a Communion which all partake of, and yet there is no Communion becauſe all partake of it. Is not this excellent Logick? The Sun ſhines which all men ſee, and yet it doth not ſhine becauſe all men ſee it. Its therefore both a falſe inference and an abſurd falſity in it ſelf, that there is an eſſentiall relation between Excommunication and the Communion, ſince the Communion may be without Excommunication, and Excommunication without the Communion. (I ſpeak as to matter of fact, not as to *jus* or *fas*, for I believe all Ordidinances ſhould be maintained in the Church, yet withall that the abſence of one Ordinance doth not null another.) There is indeed a neer relation between the Communion and Excommunication in point of duty, ſince we muſt not ſeparate thoſe things which God hath joyned (God having commanded all his Ordinances to be uſed) but not in point of being or exiſtence, ſince they depend not ſo one upon the other, that all muſt needs be aboliſhed if one be univerſally neglected.

The

The latter ſurmiſe framed by Mr. *H.* is farre more abſurd, as if either we or the objection by him propounded *made Excommunication a part of the Communion.* What is this but a contradiction *in terminis*, to make keeping from the Sacrament a part of the Sacrament, or keeping from receiving a part of receiving! From ſuch receiving we ſhall ſuſpend no unworthy perſon. We wiſh Mr. *Humphrey* much good with ſuch contradictions, but deſire him not to pin them upon our ſleeve. 2. How follows it from the Objection that Excommunication is a part of Communion? The Argument muſt ſtand thus, If free admiſſion to the Communion excommunicate Excommunication, then Excommunication is a part of the Communion; but free admiſſion doth ſo. *Ergo.* Do not the Antecedent and the Conſequent here hang together like ropes of ſand? Is it not rather true, that if free admiſſion to the Communion excommunicate Excommunication, then Excommunication is no part of the Communion? Is it not againſt nature for one part to excommunicate another?

His diſtinction between acts of Diſcipline

pline and acts of Worſhip makes little for his purpoſe. We grant them indeed to be diſtinct things; yet withall we adde, that acts of Diſcipline are no bars to acts of Worſhip, excepting onely actuall receiving in the Sacrament; (If he pleaſe to call that an act of Worſhip) I muſt therefore paſs his following diſcourſe *pag.* 33. & 34. as wholly impertinent, and tell him, that the friends of Suſpenſion are more both for Diſcipline and Worſhip then he is. 1. Becauſe we are for all the parts and degrees of Diſcipline, he is onely for ſome of them. 2. We exclude no excommunicated perſon from any part of publick Worſhip but only from actuall receiving; *Contra*, he excludes all excommunicate perſons from all publick acts of Worſhip, *pag.* 31.

2 Object. *The moſt of men are wholly unfit, and not capable of this Ordinance, as wanting both the preparatory and executory part, &c. therefore no free admiſſion hither.*

Anſw. I commend Mr. *H.* who will be ſure to chooſe Adverſaries weak enough: He may well ſay there is manifeſt weakneſs in this Argument. But he doth ill to fight againſt our weakeſt Ar-

guments, and then triumph as if we had no ſtronger.

We have ſhewed formerly, That fitneſs or unfitneſs abſolutely conſidered is no rule for the Churches admiſſion or ſuſpenſion, but either of theſe as viſible. We ſay not, that all who are unfit muſt be kept from the Sacrament, but onely all who are viſibly unfit. 2. That for the diſcerning of thoſe who are viſibly unfit, the Church muſt proceed by a rule to finde them out. 3. That triall by examination of perſons, and witneſs if need be, is a Scripture and approved rule. 4. That all are bound to ſubmit either to publick or private triall, as God offers occaſion for either, when it may be for Gods glory and their own or others edification, yea though it ſhould tend to their outward prejudice, 1 *Pet.* 3. 15. 5. That being diſcovered to be unfit, they ought to repent and ſtudy to be fit, but not to thruſt themſelves againſt light and conviction upon the Sacrament. When God ſaies, *Let a man ſo eat*, 1 Cor. 11.28. how dares any man ſay, Let him eat though not ſo? 6. If notwithſtanding perſons viſibly unfit will thruſt themſelves upon the Sacrament, its the Churches

ches duty not to let them eat and drink judgement to themſelves, by murdering the Lord of glory, unleſs Mr. *H.* be of *Cains* Religion, that Church Officers are not their brethrens keepers, *Geneſ.* 4. 9. Neither let him object, That then they may as well keep him from hearing, &c. for in part it hath, and (God willing) ſhall be more fully ſhewed, that there is a wide difference between hearing and receiving.

Now let's hear what Mr. *H.* hath to ſay againſt this Objection of his own framing.

And firſt I thank him that *pag* 35. he laies down, *That the Church can but look upon an outward capacity.* He might have added (ſince *contrariorum eadem eſt ratio*) That the Church may alſo look upon and judge of outward incapacity, but ſee and judge of it they cannot without evidence and triall; therefore 3. They may enquire after perſons capable or uncapable. 4. Since triall is in vain without execution, therefore they ought to admit all perſons outwardly capable, and ſuſpend all perſons outwardly incapable; otherwiſe how ſhall they ſuſpend (negatively at leaſt) Infants, diſtracted

and excommunicated perſons?

As to his three Anſwers, I anſwer briefly, 1. A naturall man muſt hear, pray, &c. though he cannot do them rightly, becauſe theſe are converting Ordinances, ſo is not the Lords Supper, I mean as to actuall receiving; he may therefore hear, &c. but not receive. *I wonder a wiſe man ſhould* miſtake a mountain for *a feather.*

2. Its true, every man muſt do what he can: but many things are naturally poſſible which are morally impoſſible; and thus I cannot do that which I may not, that is impoſſible which is unlawfull. Let him prove that actuall receiving is a debt on the part of a naturall man, or that to admit a perſon viſibly unworthy is a debt on the Churches part, and we ſhall be far enough from hindering any in the payment of their debts either to God or man.

3. In his laſt Anſwer, though he have borrowed a good diſtinction from Maſter *Pemble*, yet he ſhuffles wofully in the application of it. In a legall ſenſe no man is either worthy, or receives worthily; in an Evangelicall ſenſe no man receives worthily, but he is a worthy Receiver.

Receiver, But I ask Mr. *H.* whether he dares apply either branch of this distinction to all whom he admits so freely? To come to his own words, Do all that he admits, 1. Labour their best to prepare their hearts. 2. Judge and humble themselves really before God. 3. Come to Christ heavy laden. 4. Look at themselves as dogs, and yet importune Christ for the crums of mercy? I say then he hath the worthiest Congregation in the world. 2. All his Communicants are not onely worthy, but eminently godly. But now to retort. How easie were it to evince the contrary against most whom he would have admitted: For 1. How many ignorant ones are there in our Congregations, that scarce know their right hands from their left in matters of Religion. 2. How many profane ones, swearers, drunkards, &c. 3. How many outwardly pious, who upon triall might easily be uncased, to live in some known sin. Each of these fearing (and that not without cause) to be uncased before the Eldership, no wonder they are so averse to triall, lest their sheeps cloathing should be pull'd off, and themselves discovered to be ignorant, profane, or hypo-

criticall, far enough from the forementioned graces of humility, repentance, and faith. If he object that ſuch perſons ſhould be excommunicated, I anſwer, 1. Whoever deſerve Excommunication, do much more deſerve Suſpenſion; and it ſeems then, that the Presbyterians offend rather in being too favourable then too rigid. 2. We deny not, but in caſe of obſtinacy or foul ſcandall, diſmembring may follow Suſpenſion, the greater Excommunication the leſſer. 3. I hope Mr, *Humphrey* is more charitable then to profeſs that all ignorant perſons ſhould be excommunicated. I am ſure we are ſo charitable, as by Suſpenſion to put them upon endeavours after knowledge, that they may be fitted for, and ſo comfortably admitted to the Sacrament, Which his free admiſſion is not like to do; but rather to harden and flatter them in their ignorance.

He notes well, *pag.*37. That on the unworthy receivers part, *the Ordinance is taken in vain, againſt the third Commandment.* But whereas he adds, *not ſo on the admitters part.*

Anſ. The admitters having regularly the power of the Keyes, if they admit perſons

perſons viſibly unworthy, are acceſſary to their guilt; as any one is an acceſſary in Gods account, who prevents not the ſin of his neighbour when he hath power to do it.

3 Object. *Holy things to holy men.*

An. I may ſay of this as of the former, There is little ſtrength in it. Yet withall, Mr. *H.* his Anſwer falls ſhort, and is too too feeble likewiſe. For 1. All outward holy things are not to be adminiſtred to all outwardly holy perſons, ſince Infants and diſtracted perſons (if Chriſtians) are outwardly (yea divers of them inwardly) holy, yet by Mr. *H.* his vote are not capable of the Sacrament. 2. Some things outwardly holy may be adminiſtred to perſons not ſo much as outwardly holy by profeſſion, *Mat.* 28.19. & 1 *Cor.* 14.24. 3. What is bare profeſſion if contradicted by profaneſs? That which cannot ſecure a man from Excommunication, but rather makes him capable of it, much leſs can ſecure him againſt Suſpenſion, an inferiour Cenſure. But ſuch is bare profeſſion if accompanied with profaneſs. 4. Many perſons excommunicated do ſtill profeſs, and ſo are outwardly holy, yet theſe Mr. *H.* will have excluded from

all Ordinances. From all which I conclude, 1. That M. *H.* his Anſwer may vye with the Objection for weakneſſe. 2. That M. *H.* here as well as otherwhere contradicts himſelf, in ſaying that the ſame perſon at the ſame time muſt be admitted to all the Ordinances, and yet he muſt be admitted to none of the Ordinances; to all the Ordinances as a profeſſor, to none of the Ordinances as excommunicated; a cruel aſſertion and a flat contradiction.

For the Reply *pag.* 38, & 39. *Do we not hereby make our ſelves one with the wicked with whom we joyn and ſo have communion with Belial?* His anſwer is good, *That joyning with a wicked mans perſon is not having communion with Belial, but accompanying of him in his evil wayes.*

But our difference here with M. *H.* is not ſo much about joyning with the wicked, as accompanying of him in his evil wayes: It being firſt his ſin to receive unworthily; Secondly, The peoples ſin who know him to be unworthy and do not inform the Church: Thirdly, The Churches fault if they ſtudy not the diſcovery of perſons unworthy, or admit them to the Sacrament when viſibly unworthy: Nor is preſence with the wicked

at

at Ordinances, but foſtering of them in their ſins, communion with Belial, which I wiſh too many do not fall into by this free admiſſion, pleaded for with more ſtrength of affection then power of conviction.

We eaſily agree with him, *That wicked perſons in the Church, are in ſome ſenſe in Chriſt and ſanctified by him*: But if this be enough for admiſſion to the Lords Supper, then why doth himſelf ſhut the Chancel door (as he otherwhere calls it) againſt Infants and mad men, who are as much if not more in Chriſt, and as much if not more ſanctified then the former, and againſt whom himſelf dares not ſhut the Church door. Therefore ſay I, if M. *H.* be really for free admiſſion, let him exclude none out of the Chancel that are within the Church. For the places of Scripture that he quotes *page* 40. I am confident the Orthodox interpretation of them, will never open the Chancel to groſly ignorant or prophane Church-members; the latter of which are ſo far from having right to be admitted into the Chancel, that they deſerve to be ſhut out of the Church.

To cloſe up this third Objection: How groſſe

groſſe is that aſſertion *pag.*41. *That there is an hiſtoricall viſible faith, that gives an outward Church-right unto the Elements.*

For then firſt excommunicated perſons have a right to the Elements, who though caſt out for their prophaneneſſe, have ſtill an hiſtoricall faith, ſince excommunication doth not deprive you of their hiſtoricall faith, yet cuts them off 1. from viſible Church-memberſhip, 2. from viſible Chriſt-memberſhip.

2. Saving faith it ſelf doth not alwayes give a right to the Elements (it being poſſible that a godly man for ſome foul ſcandall may be excommunicated) much leſſe then doth viſible hiſtoricall faith, when contradicted eſpecially by cuſtomary prophaneſſe.

3. As hiſtoricall faith gives not a right to Chriſt (for that the devils have, *Iames* 2. 19.) but the faith of adheſion ſeated in the will not in the underſtanding, ſo not viſible hiſtoricall faith, but viſible faith of adheſion gives a Church-right to Chriſt ſacramentall, and ſhould any man profeſſe hiſtoricall faith but proteſt againſt faith of adheſion, I appeal to M. *H.* his conſcience, whether he durſt admit ſuch a wretch to the Sacrament. For my own part,

part,, ſhould any perſon profeſſe, I beleeve Jeſus Chriſt to be the Son of God, the only Saviour and Mediator between God and man, but I will not reſt upon him for righteouſneſſe and ſalvation; let this man be never ſo pious outwardly, I ſhould ſooner admit a common adulterer, *&c.* then him.

Objection 4. *page* 41. *The Seal is ſet to a blank if all be admitted.*

*An.*1. For underſtanding this Objection the better, we muſt know, that what the Philoſopher ſaid in generall, that *Anima eſt raſa tabula*, is too true of all men ſince the fall in order unto ſaving grace. They are *Tabulæ*, as capable of the Spirits writing; they are *raſæ tabulæ*, which notes 1. They are naturally deſtitute of this writing. 2. This writing was raſed out by *Adams* fall, and thus all men naturally are blanks, in order to the writing of the new Covenant in their hearts: The ſimilitude you have 2 *Cor.*3.3. *Heb.*8.10.

2. This Blank is either viſible or inviſible. To God all blanks are viſible, and he may uſe his liberty to ſet his ſeal where he pleaſes, by commanding to baptiſe all Infants of beleeving parents, *&c.* and to admit to the Lords Supper all viſible Saints

Saints that are Church-members.

The Queſtion is then, Whether man may apply the Seals to viſible blanks. It's clear he may not; for then Heathen themſelves before inſtruction and profeſſion, as alſo their Infants might be baptiſed. I aſſume, But there are viſible blanks in the Church as well as in the world, namely perſons that are as notoriouſly ignorant and profane as Heathen, and who if they had not been baptiſed in their infancy, ſhould not be now admitted to baptiſm, without evidence firſt given of their knowledge and piety. Therefore ſay I, ſeeing (according to M. *H.* his own rule) *Adultis eadem eſt ratio utriuſq; Sacramenti*, they who at preſent would be uncapable of baptiſme had they not been baptiſed, are not to be admitted to the Lords Supper though baptiſed in their infancy. The Objection thus ſtated we conceive to be good: Lets ſee now what M. *H.* hath to object againſt it. I ſhall at preſent paſſe his firſt diſtinction as waved yet by himſelf.

Page 41, and 42. *He conceives it's a generall miſtake, that people take the Sacrament to be a Seal to their faith, and if there be no true faith, that it is ſet (they think) to a blank.* *Anſw.*

Anſw. 1. Sacramentall ſeals (as others) relate either to parties or to things. 1. To parties, namely the Covenanters on both parts, God and the creature in Covenant; from God to the creature they ſeal the Covenant of grace, from the creature to God they ſeal dutifulneſſe and thankfulneſſe. Here we ſay, the Church cannot apply the ſeals of the Covenant to any who are viſibly out of the Covenant; but in our Congregations there are many groſly ignorant and prophane perſons viſibly out of the Covenant. You will ſay, they are viſibly in the Covenant as Church-members and profeſſors though at large; True, but their viſible profeſſion is not equivalent to their viſible ignorance and prophaneneſſe, no more then profeſſion of honeſty is to open cheating: as a cheater uncaſed loſes the repute and priviledges of an honeſt man, ſo an hypocrite uncaſed forfeits the priviledges of his profeſſion, and the Church both may and ought to take the forfeiture, till the breach made upon his profeſſion be repaired by a new profeſſion of his repentance and promiſe of reformation, yea and viſible reformation too, ſo far as it can be had: and certainly, if ſuch a perſon may be

be denied all publike Ordinances (in M. *H.* his judgement) much more may he be denied one Ordinance. He that deſerves the greater penalty, much more deſerves the leſſe.

Secondly, To come neerer to his Anſwer: Sacramentall Seals relate to things as well as to perſons: And thus as Seals, 1. They confirm the Covenant. 2. They confirm the faith of the worthy receiver. 3. They confirm judgement to the unworthy receiver. To apply the diſtinction: 1. All ſorts may be preſent to ſee the Covenant ſealed. 2. None but perſons Evangelically worthy may partake, theſe only having faith to be confirmed. 3. None viſibly unworthy may by the Church be admitted to partake, as being viſibly without faith, either in the habit or actings thereof; which laſt I note in reference to godly perſons who ſometimes may be juſtly either ſuſpended or excommunicated. 4. Suppoſing they may be admitted on the Miniſters part where the power of the Keyes is imperfect, yet to clear his own ſoul the Miniſter is to deal plainly with every unworthy receiver, and let him know that he will but betray and murther Chriſt, as our Saviour did to *Judas* (ſuppoſing

poſing he did receive,) and that the Sacrament which confirms other mens faith, will confirm his unbelief and ſeal judgement unto him. To ſumme up all: That which confirms or ratifies is tropically a Seal; but the Sacrament doth confirm faith and ratifie the Covenant to faith, *Ergo*, Its both a ſeal of faith, and a ſeal to faith; *& contra*, where there is no faith to confirm, as to that particular it muſt needs ſeal to a blank, as ſealing to a blank is a known expreſſion to note the application of a ſeal to a paper that hath no writing, and where nothing is writ there nothing can be confirmed.

2. That the Sacrament ſeals Chriſts bloud in particular for pardon to the receivers by vertue of its primitive inſtitution, is evident by comparing *Matth.*26. 28. with *Luk.*22.20. The latter place ſaith, *This cup is the new Teſtament in my bloud which is ſhed for you:* the former place ſheweth for what end, namely *for remiſſion of ſins.* The language then of the Sacrament given to every receiver is; the body and bloud of Chriſt is thine for the remiſſion of thy ſins, and how dares any Miniſter ſay or ſeal this to a perſon known to be groſly ignorant or profane?

Pag. 42. *God doth not atteſt our faith, but the truth of his own promiſes, but the Sacraments are Seals properly of the Covenant.*

Anſw. 1. I know none ſo ſimple as to aſſert that God doth *in terminis* * atteſt our faith in the Sacrament, as M. *H.* ſeems to inſinuate; the Sacrament doth not ſo atteſt but ſuppoſe and require faith, and then ſeals the Covenant to faith. 2. In vain doth it ſeal the Covenant, if to no perſons: A Covenant cannot be but with ſome body, and if it be ſealed it muſt be ſealed to thoſe with whom it is made: therefore the Covenant being ſealed in the Sacrament, it muſt be ſealed to ſome body, and ſealed regularly it cannot be to thoſe who viſibly reject it: but groſly ignorant and prophane perſons uncaſed, do viſibly reject the Covenant of grace, *Ergo*, the Covenant of grace cannot regularly be applied to them by the Seals. 3. If the Sacraments are ſeals properly of the Covenant, why may not Infants and diſtracted perſons partake of them, who have a more viſible right to it then groſly ignorant and prophane perſons have? 4. As the Sacraments are ſeals of the Covenant, ſo they may be applied to the Covenant,

* My meaning is, the Sacrament doth not ſay in expres terms thou *Roger* beleeveſt, no more then the word doth, but only by conſequence.

Covenant before all, but the Covenant may not by them be applied or ſealed to any but to perſons viſibly worthy. Its well therefore in the ſame page he corrects himſelf, and grants *the Sacraments may be ſeals of our faith* conſecutivè, *becauſe they confirm and ſtrengthen faith*: But he ſhuffles in ſaying, *They are not* formaliter, *and in a true and proper ſenſe ſeales unto any thing but the Covenant.* In a proper ſenſe a ſeal is an artificiall thing fit to make a viſible repreſentation or impreſſion and confirmation. This the Sacrament is not properly but figuratively to the Covenant it ſelf, namely as it hath the office of a ſeal, which is to repreſent and confirm, and this it doth to faith as well as to the Covenant: For 1. As it repreſents the Covenant, it muſt needs repreſent faith as an eſpeciall branch promiſed in the Covenant. 2. As it confirms the Covenant, ſo it confirms faith gradually offered and promiſed in it, and thereby alſo confirms faith inherent in the worthy receiver, as a Bond ſealed unto me confirms my belief that the particulars ſealed unto ſhall be performed, and if this be not to ſeal in a formal and proper ſenſe (theologically) I know not what is. And thus

increaſe of faith and all other graces are ſealed by the Sacrament to the worthy receiver, but neither the beginnings nor increaſe of faith are ſealed to the unworthy receiver.

Nor will his inſtance of Circumciſion, *pag.*43. help him as to the point in hand, ſince Circumciſion was applied to none but viſible Saints, either by Covenant, election, or by actuall profeſſion, not contradicted by living in ſcandalous ſins, or notorious ignorance of the Covenant of grace, which is the rule we walk by in admiſſion or non-admiſſion.

And as little advantage will his cauſe gain by his illuſtration (here again repeated) drawn from a Proclamation ſealed and offered to rebels that refuſe it. True, the ſimilitnde holds in ſome particulars: 1. The Covenant of grace is proclaimed by the Miniſter. 2. The truth of it is ſealed by the Sacrament. 3. The benefits of it offered to all, and therefore we deny not but all ſorts may be preſent at the Ordinance, as all rebels whether obſtinate or ſubmiſſive may be preſent at the Proclamation and ſealing of a Pardon. But what is offering a ſealed Pardon in generall and conditionally, to the particular applica-

tion

tion and ſealing of the ſame Pardon to ſingular perſons? Or how can a Commiſſioner without breach of his truſt, aſſure (either by word of mouth or ſeal) pardon to a Traytor that viſibly ſtands out againſt his Prince? In like manner at the Sacrament, not only the Elements do repreſent and ſeal the Covenant of grace as to its truth in generall, but ſome of the Sacramentall actions (as giving and receiving) do particularly apply it to every receiver: And how dares any Miniſter, having regular power to deny it, by word and ſeal apply the Covenant of grace to any perſon that viſibly rejects it? To illuſtrate this by the initiall Sacrament; Baptiſm when ever adminiſtred, ſeals the Covenant of grace as well as the Lords Supper; but only to the perſon baptized doth it make particular application of the Covenant, and therefore cannot be applied to any unbaptized perſon that is viſibly out of the Covenant, be he born of Heathen or of Chriſtian Parents: But all who are viſibly in the ſtate of nature are viſibly out of the Covenant, and ſuch are groſly ignorant, and ſcandalous perſons willfully perſiſting in both. Since therefore both Sacraments ſeal one and

the ſame Covenant, he who ſhould not be admitted to the firſt were he unbaptized, muſt not *pari ratione* be admitted to the ſecond though baptized.

*Pag.*44. *Rep.* by M.*H.* *But is it not abſurd for a man to ſet his ſeal where there hath been no agreement and tranſactions before,* &c. M. *H.* grants it's abſurd on the receivers part; *but as for the Miniſter or Church who offer it as a ſeal on Gods part, there is a true ſeal to a true copy, and nothing out of order.*

Anſw. There's nothing out of order if the Miniſter proceed not to delivery of the writing and ſeal to thoſe who viſibly refuſe the Covenant offered. But ſhould M.*H.* or any elſe deliver a purchaſe ſealed to a perſon who refuſed the bargain, let himſelf be Judge whether it were not an act both diſorderly and imprudent: And as diſorderly is it to deliver unto any perſon bond and ſeal for the promiſed Land who viſibly prefers *Ægypt* and *Babylon* before it. God will not Miniſters ſhould deliver precious pearls to ſuch ſwine.

What he addes *Pag.* 45. is alſo weak, in which reſpect he doth well to cover the nakedneſſe of it with a blinde and miſty parentheſis. His words are theſe: *As they*

are

are Gods ſeals, for the ſame reaſon they cannot be ſeals of faith, becauſe God ſeals not imaginably to our part of the Covenant which is faith.

Anſw. 1. Both the aſſertion it ſelf and its reaſon are falſe. For

Firſt, Are they not Gods ſeals, 1. As relating to Gods Covenant. 2. As inſtituted by God himſelf to ratifie his Covenant.

Secondly, Is not faith it ſelf and every ſaving grace promiſed in the New Covenant? unleſſe M. *H.* will profeſſedly turn Pelagian, and make faith only the birth of mans free-will.

Thirdly, If the Covenant be Gods, if the ſeal be Gods, and faith promiſed in it be Gods alſo, is it not apparent that Gods ſeal muſt needs be faiths ſeal alſo? Not a ſeal from faith authoritatively as from God, but a ſeal of faith as a branch of the Covenant promiſed, and as a ſeal to faith actually laying hold on the Covenant. If the Covenant of grace undertake not for our part of the Covenant, we are in a worſe condition now under the Covenant of grace then we were under the Covenant of works, ſince then *Adam* had perfection of grace to back free-will; but

in fallen man free-will either hath no grace inherent, or but weak grace to act it, and impoſſible were it for any either to convert or perſevere, unleſſe God undertook both for the infuſion and ſupporting of grace.

Et. If faith and grace be a part of the Covenant that is ſealed by the Sacrament, then the beſt way were free admiſſion, that the Covenant, and ſo faith it ſelf may be ſealed to all.

Vv. Not ſo: For 1. Though the Covenant offer grace to all conditionally, yet it promiſeth not grace abſolutely to any but the elect and perſons effectually called: to the firſt it promiſeth initiall grace, to the latter it promiſeth progreſſe and perſeverance in grace. Now the ſeal can ſecure no more then what is in the writing: but ſaving grace is not abſolutely promiſed to all, in the Covenant, *ergò* it cannot be ſealed to all in the Sacrament. The offer of grace indeed is ſealed to all preſent whether they receive it or no; but the promiſe of grace can be ſealed to none but the Legatees of the new Covenant, and ſuch are only perſons elected or effectually called, underſtand me here as to the ſpirituall and ſaving branches of the Covenant:

venant: and that is done on Gods part every Sacrament.

Secondly, As for the Church and the Miniſter, who cannot judge infallibly who are elected and effectually called, they muſt proceed by the rule of viſibility, ſealing the promiſes by the Sacrament, to them and them only who upon juſt triall tempered with charity appear to be viſible Legatees. And as Chriſt himſelf reſpects not good words and outward profeſſion when contradicted by our carriage, *Matth.*7. 21,22,23. no more muſt the Chnrch when mens carriage doth viſibly contradict their profeſſion.

Thirdly, The Lords Supper being a Sacrament of nouriſhment, ſeals not properly initiall, but progreſſive grace; nor can the Church apply it for converſion but edification: and how are they capable of edification in grace who are deſtitute of all grace, or of viſible edification who are deſtitute of viſible grace?

Fourthly, In the Lords Supper, not only ſanctification but alſo the comforts of the Covenant are ſealed to the receivers, but how can the comforts of holineſſe be ſealed to unholy perſons, or by the Miniſter applied to thoſe who are viſibly unholy, *Ezek.*13.19,21.

Pag. 46. He ſpeaks clearly and truly; *That an unregenerate man cannot receive the Sacrament as a ſeal of his faith.* For how can faith be ſealed to where it is not? But what follows immediately, *Yet the Church can give it as a ſeal of the Covenant*, is either ambiguous or falſe; ambiguous if he take giving for giving out or holding forth, for thus Chriſt may be given to all, whether they receive or no; but this is nothing to his purpoſe, and proves onely that all may be preſent, but not that all may receive. Its falſe if underſtood of the delivery of the Elements to all perſons who may be preſent. 1. In Mr. *Humphrey* his ſenſe, who cannot Scripturally or rationally exclude either Infants, diſtracted or excommunicated perſons from preſence, yet will not admit them actually to receive. 2. Its falſe in our ſenſe, who can admit either ignorant or ſcandalous perſons to be preſent, but neither of them to receive.

Gal. 3. 1.

His illuſtration *ibid.* drawn from the Word preached, makes againſt him if rightly ſtated. *True, there may be true preaching, though the hearers apply not the Word by faith.* But can there be true preaching, where the Miniſter applies the

the Word wrong, binding where he ſhould looſe, and looſing where he ſhould binde with the Key of Doctrine? No more doth that Miniſter do his duty, who in the Lords Supper looſes where he ſhould binde, and ſeals comfort to him who is not a viſible Saint.

Whereas in the cloſe of *pag.* 46. he would make us believe *there is not one tittle of Scripture to prove the Sacraments to be mans ſeals*,

Anſw. 1. He ſpeaks darkly and ambiguouſly, as if he would make us believe they were not mans ſeales becauſe they are Gods ſeales; by which Logick he might as well prove the Sabbath were not mans becauſe it is Gods, and the Goſpel were not mans becauſe it is Gods, yea that nothing were mans becauſe all things were Gods, as if humane propriety contradicted Divine Supremacy.

2. If he mean the Sacraments are not mans ſeals by inſtitution, That is true, but nothing to his purpoſe. The broad ſeal is not mine by inſtitution, yet I may truly ſay the broad ſeal is mine, when I have a patent or pardon ſealed by it.

3. Doth not the finall cauſe give as true propriety as the efficient, nay uſually more?

more? A ſeal, a ſuit, an houſe, &c. is more his for whom it is made, then his that makes it. God indeed hath a double propriety in the Sacrament, as made both by him and for him, namely to ſeal his Covenant, &c. but it being made for man alſo, man hath a true propriety in it, as he for whom either a ſeal or a meal is made, hath in both. Its ridiculous therefore he would ſeem at leaſt to aſſert, The Sacraments are not mans ſeals, and yet grant pag. 47. *They are mans ſeals in uſe.* Doth he not know that a Sacrament *extra uſum* hath no being, and ſo is neither Gods ſeal nor mans ſeal, and that in uſe it is both Gods ſeal and mans ſeal, a ſeal from God to man, and from man to God?

The Covenant indeed ſtands ſealed by God to all conditionally, *but will that acquit the Church in delivering the ſigns to all*, as Mr. *H.* would have it *pag.* 47. Then why may not even Heathen or excommunicated perſons receive, to whom the Covenant is offered and ſealed conditionally?

Again, *That the tenour of the Goſpel is ſealed abſolutely by the Sacrament, but not our intereſt in it*, as he notes in the ſame page,

page, is true in the first branch, but false in the second, since not onely the tenour of the Covenant is sealed absolutely to the worthy Receiver, but also his interest in it. 2. To those who are visibly worthy, the Minister seals their visible interest; which visible interest, because some in the Church have not, therefore the Minister cannot seal it to them by giving them the Elements, but by consecration and application of the Sacrament to others before their eyes, doth seal even to the standers by the tenour of the Gospel in the Lords Supper, as well as in Baptisme. In both Sacraments the offer of grace is sealed to all, yea even to Heathen &c. but reall interest is sealed only to reall Saints and worthy Receivers, as visible interest to visible Saints.

Grant *the Word speaks not particularly of any mans single interest by name*, yet it doth by signes, and whosoever findes those signes in himself, hath as true an interest in the Covenant, as if he were mentioned in it by name. The Scripture saith not particularly of Mr. *H.* that he shall rise at the day of judgement, yet I hope Mr. *H.* doubts not of his resurrection in particular: nor doth the Scripture

ture ſay Mr. *H.* ſhall be ſaved, yet if Mr. *H.* have ſaving faith, it doth as particularly aſſure him of ſalvation, as if he were mentioned by name, &c. Now the ſeals run parallel with the Covenant, and aſſure conditionall ſalvation to all, viſible ſalvation to viſible Saints, reall ſalvation to reall Saints, to the firſt by the outward adminiſtration, to the ſecond by viſible application, to the third by reall and ſpirituall application.

Whereas therefore *page* 48. Mr. *H.* pleaſeth himſelf with this Embryon of his own brain, which being formerly conceived by *a piercing and godly man converted his opinion*, as he ſaies.

And, if I miſtake not, this piercing godly man is far from Mr. *H.* his judgment in point of free admiſſion.

Anſ. 1. I hope that godly perſon (if ſo) was converted before Mr. *Humphrey* his Embryon was hatched. 2. I ſee little of converſion or piety in admitting all pell mell to the Sacrament. 3. I wiſh his converſion by entertainment of this opinion, be not like that of the *Galatians*. Its a common errour in theſe looſe times, to miſtake perverſion for converſion: Such converſion calls for repentance, which I wiſh to this godly man.

For further confirmation, *pag.* 48. he propounds the tenour of the Covenant in

in a ſyllogiſm, thus, *He that believes ſhall be ſaved*; adde, *I believe*, Ergo, *I ſhall be ſaved*. Then he denies that the Sacrament ſeals either the minor or the concluſion.

Anſw. The Sacrament ſeals what the Covenant of grace promiſes, but the Covenant of grace promiſes (and not only offers) ſalvation to particular perſons, *Rom.* 10. 9. *That if thou ſhalt confeſs*, &c. *thou ſhalt be ſaved*. This is evident by the promiſe of ſalvation to believers in generall, *Mark* 16. 16. *John* 3. 16. What is promiſed to a whole kinde, is promiſed to every particular of that kinde. Let Mr. *H.* tell me how the Sacrament ſeals the offer of grace to him in particular, and I will tell him how it may alſo ſeal the promiſe of grace or ſalvation to him or any elſe in particular. Where is it ſaid in Scripture, I offer to thee *John Humphrey* Miniſter of *Froome*, &c. grace and ſalvation by Jeſus Chriſt; will Mr. *H.* yet deny the offer of grace is made as particularly to him, as if he had been named in Scripture? Or where is it ſaid, Thou *John Humphrey* ſhalt not commit adultery, &c. yet doth not that command reach him as particularly as if he were named? He that ſaies, *Omnis homo eſt animal*

animal rationale, doth he not as truly ſay that Mr. *H.* is *Animal rationale*, as if he had mentioned him by name? In like manner, when the Scripture ſaies, *All that believe ſhall be ſaved*, doth it not ſay, that Mr. *H.* believing ſhall be ſaved? If therefore Mr. *H. de facto* do believe, it promiſes ſalvation as particularly to him as if he were mentioned by name; or that I believing ſhall be ſaved, as if my name were in the promiſe. Where the condition is performed, there the promiſe is abſolute; but when I believe, the condition is performed, *Ergo*, the promiſe, That I ſhall be ſaved, is abſolute. This premiſed, I reſume, What the Covenant promiſeth, that the Sacrament ſeals. The Covenant promiſes that I ſhall be ſaved in particular, *Ergo*, the Sacrament ſeals that I ſhall be ſaved in particular: But this is the concluſion which Mr. *H.* denied to be ſealed by the Sacrament.

Next for the minor of his ſyllogiſme namely, That *I believe*, I ſhall prove againſt him, that this is alſo ſealed in the Sacrament, not to all Receivers, but to all worthy Receivers, thus, as formerly, What the Covenant enſures, that the Sacrament

crament ſeals; the Covenant aſſures me that I believe; *Ergo*, the Sacrament ſeals to me that I believe. The minor, which onely is queſtionable, I prove thus: That which gives to me clear evidence that I believe, that aſſures me I believe. The Covenant gives me clear evidence that I believe; *Ergo*. The minor is good, becauſe the Covenant affords infallible ſignes and evidences of faith in what heart ſoever it is; and ſo of faith in my heart particularly, or in any other heart whatſoever. As therefore by the properties of a man, I may know my ſelf to be a man, ſo by the properties of faith held forth in the Covenant, I may know my ſelf to have faith. That Goſpel which ſaies, He who receives Chriſt for righteouſneſs, &c. believes, the ſame Goſpel ſaies, That I receiving Chriſt for righteouſneſs do believe, and ſo by conſequence it ſaith abſolutely, that I believe. But what the Covenant affirms, that the Sacrament ſeals or ratifies; namely, that I believe in particular. And this is the minor which Mr. *H.* denies to be ſealed by the Sacrament.

For clearer explication, conſider that the minor or aſſumption of the Syllogiſm

of

of aſſurance depends partly upon faith, and partly upon ſenſe or experience; upon faith, that the evidence is right *in actu ſignato*, and not a falſe evidence; upon ſenſe or experience, *in actu exercito*, that this right evidence is in me. For as a falſe evidence in me, ſo a right evidence without me, are both equally null and invalid as to aſſurance. For example, Would I know my faith is right, and thereby come to aſſurance that I am in the ſtate of grace? I muſt look into the Word by a direct act of my underſtanding for a true and undoubted evidence of faith, and into mine own heart by a reflex act, whether that true evidence of ſaving faith be indeed in me. As in the Syllogiſme of aſſurance about my particular reſurrection at the day of judgement, the major, That all men ſhall riſe, is in tearms in Scripture: the minor, That I *John* or *Roger* am a man, is not expreſly in Scripture, but depends partly upon faith, as to the eſſentiall notes of a man recorded in Scripture, partly upon ſenſe, I finding by a reflex act, that thoſe eſſentiall ſignes of humanity are in me; from both which the concluſion flows neceſſarily, that I in particular ſhall riſe at the day

day of judgement. And indeed, had not a concluſion drawn partly from faith and partly from ſenſe been firm, Chriſts apparitions had not been a ſolid argument to confirm the reſurrection, which yet he proves partly by Scripture out of *Moſes*, the Prophets and Pſalmes; partly by ſenſe and experience, *Luk.*24 39,46. and though it be poſſible in ſome caſes ſenſe may be deceived, yet a man in his right wits may eaſily know that *hic & nunc* ſenſe is not deceived: And were not this true, no man could poſſibly be convinced of his eſtate, or that he is a ſinner, or that his life is frail and ſhort, or that faith and repentance is his duty, or any other Divine truth that concerns himſelf in particular, ſince its no where ſaid in Scripture, Thou *Roger* art a ſinner, thy life in particular is frail and ſhort, faith and repentance is thy duty; but all theſe in Scripture are expreſſed onely in generall tearms. Yet I hope its as true *de fide* that faith and repentance is my duty, as if the Scripture ſhould ſay, Thou *Roger* muſt believe and repent, &c. The major then in the Syllogiſme of aſſurance is in tearms *de fide*. The minor alſo (as to the truth of the evidence) is expreſly *de fide*;

but as to the inbeing of the evidence, it depends upon ſenſe and experience; the concluſion is *de fide* by neceſſary conſequence, though not in expreſs tearms. Now whatſoever is *de fide*, that is ſealed in the Sacrament; ſo are all three Propoſitions in the Syllogiſme (though the minor is partly of faith and partly of ſenſe) therefore all three Propoſitions of the Syllogiſme of aſſurance are ſealed by the Sacrament; contrary to Mr. *H.* his Aſſertion. And ſince the minor in the Syllogiſme of aſſurance (namely, that I believe) is the concluſion in the proſ-Syllogiſme, it follows neceſſarily, that this Propoſition (I believe) is *de fide* by conſequence, though not *de fide* in tearms.

Object. The Sacrament ſuppoſeth aſſurance, and therefore doth not work aſſurance; It ſuppoſeth I believe and repent (which therefore muſt be made out by previous examination) doth not evidence that I believe and repent, and therefore doth not ſeal the *minor* or *aſſumption* in the Syllogiſme of aſſurance.

Anſw. 1. As the Sacrament works grace, ſo it works aſſurance of grace, and as it is a means of grace, ſo it is a means

means of assurance. Now the Sacrament (as received) is not a means of initiall but of progressive grace, doth not beget grace at first by regeneration, but increase and strengthen grace by nourishment and confirmation, partly by acting grace, and partly by holding forth, applying, and sealing the promises of the Covenant to every worthy Receiver. What therefore the Word doth audibly (in order to confirmation) that the Sacrament doth visibly; what the Word applies generally, that the Sacrament applies particularly; what the Word applies by one sense, that the Sacrament applies by all our senses, and therefore must needs be a more powerfull means of assurance then the Word. The Word indeed is the instrumentall cause of initiall grace, and ordinarily of initiall assurance: but the Sacrament may be sometimes the means of initiall assurance, and ordinarily is the means and instrument of progressive assurance. My meaning is, that whosoever comes to the Sacrament rightly prepared, having both truth of grace and the evidence of grace, this man or woman shall go away from the Sacrament with more degrees of grace, and clearer evidence of

grace; and he or she that comes to the Lords Supper with the worthiness of person, and of preparation, though haply he may want evidence, yet may go away from the Sacrament triumphing in the assurance of Gods love. He that comes to the Sacrament with the Prophets fear, *I am undone*, &c. may go away from it with this assurance, *Thine iniquity is taken away, and thy sin purged*, Isa.6.5,7. As I at the Sacrament assure God of my obedience, so God at the Sacrament assures me of his love; and if I be reall in my assurance as to uprightness, God is as reall in his assurance as to my comfort, *Psal.*18.25. God in an especiall manner in the Sacrament delights *to shew himself upright with the upright*; and then if ever *leads* his Spouse *into the wine cellar* or banquetting house, and *spreads his banner of love over her*, Cant. 2. 4. *When she is sick of love, then he staies her with flagons, and comforts her with apples*; *His left hand is under her head, and his right hand doth imbrace her*. Then in an especiall manner *he kisseth her with the kisses of his mouth*, Cant.1.1. and though *Judas* did, *Jesus* will never give a treacherous kiss.

The major himself grants is sealed in the

the Sacrament, the minor and concluſion we have proved to be ſealed in the Sacrament. Whereby it appears that the whole Syllogiſme of aſſurance is ſealed by the Sacrament to the worthy Receiver, but onely the major Propoſition to perſons really unworthy. Withall, hereby it is evident, that the Sacrament is not onely Gods ſeal, but alſo the ſeal of faith and of the beleever, whatever Mr. *H.* pretends to the contrary. And ſo I paſs to the fifth Objection, *pag.* 49.

Object. 5. The Covenant belongs not to all, therefore the Seals neither.

Mr. *H.* anſwers, The Covenant belongs to all conditionally, *according to the tenour of the Goſpel, that whoſoever believes ſhall be ſaved.*

Anſw. So the Sacrament belongs to all conditionally, but onely to worthy Receivers abſolutely. *Pag.* 50. he ſaves me a labour, and anſwers himſelf in theſe words, *If you will reſolve to accept Chriſt as your Lord and Saviour, to forſake ſin,* &c. *lo here is the ſeal of God on his part,* &c. Here indeed he ſhews, That as the Covenant, ſo the Sacrament belongs to all conditionally. But what if moſt do not, will not accept of Chriſt, &c. (which is

de facto the case of grosly ignorant and profane persons) will Mr. *H.* invite these also to receive the Seals together with the former?

Hear him in his own words, pag. 51. *To speak sincerely, if we should propose two men, one that is not in Covenant with Christ, and one that is, this Sacrament doth more ingenuously belong unto the first, &c.* If this be not a rare and new Light, I know not what is. Now you have the man painted by himself in his own colours. Come ye drunkards, whoremasters, murderers, and all the rabble of hell, here is sincere and comfortable Doctrine for you indeed, The Sacrament doth more ingenuously belong to you then to any that are in covenant with Christ. I but Mr. *H.* means this, *in case they now resolve to enter into Covenant with Christ, ibid.* Absurd, and a contradiction *in adjecto*, as if he who in truth resolves to enter into Covenant with Christ, were not at that very instant in covenant with Christ. He would say, if he could hit it, The Sacrament belongs more properly to weak then to strong beleevers: but by an ill gloss he corrupts the Text, and instead of a weak beleever renders one out of Covenant,

and

and for a ſtrong beleever, one in Covenant. We grant, the duty of the Covenant belongs to all, but not the promiſe of the Covenant till its duty be performed. In like manner, preparation belongs to all, but not actuall receiving till that duty be performed. All are not bid to eat abſolutely, but ſo to eat, 1 *Cor.* 11.28.

In the ſame page by diſtinguiſhing the Covenant from its benefit, he ſeems to make a diſtinction without a difference, as if the benefit of the Covenant were not an eſſentiall part of the Covenant. Haply by Covenant he means the duty or condition of the Covenant which indeed is of *epidemicall concernment:* yet becauſe in the ſame place he ſpeaks of a free tender and offer; that croſſes this conſtruction, and ſeems to carry it, that by Covenant there, muſt be meant the benefit of the Covenant which is tendred conditionally to all; but then what ſenſe can be made of his diſtinction, The benefit of the Covenant belongs not to any out of Chriſt, but the Covenant it ſelf belongs to all, that is, the benefit of the Covenant (as his ſenſe carries it) belongs to all? Is not here a contradiction *in terminis? The benefit of the Covenant belongs not to any out of Chriſt,*

yet the benefit of the Covenant belongs to all. If it belongs to *all*, how doth it not belong to any out of Chriſt? *contrà*, if it belongs to none out of Chriſt, how doth it belong to *all?* But no wonder he falls into ſelf-contradiction, who will venture to contradict the truth.

Rep. He would ſay Sacrament.

But what right doth this give him to the *Covenant?* Pag. 52. M. *H. diſtinguiſheth of a right of Obligation and a right of Priviledge; and as to the former he there avouches an Univerſall right to every Ordinance, they being duties of Worſhip which is of univerſall command: for proof he quotes*, Iſa. 66. 23.

Anſw. If all be bound to come without exception, then why doth himſelf exclude children and diſtracted perſons?

Secondly, All Chriſtians have a mediate, but only prepared Chriſtians an immediate right to the Sacrament, as all *Iſrael* had a mediate, but only purified perſons an immediate right to the Paſſeover, *Numb.* 9. 10.

Thirdly, All are obliged to every part of worſhip, but 1. Not at all times, ſince affirmative precepts binde not *ad ſemper.* 2. Not in all caſes, as an unconverted perſon is not bound to praiſe God for his converſion,

converſion, *&c.* which he hath not.

To apply the diſtinction: The time of every Sacrament is not a fit ſeaſon for every perſon, whether it be by his own default, or by divine providence. 2. In caſe of preſent incapacity, receiving, though an act of worſhip, is not ſinfully omitted unleſſe that omiſſion be joyned with contempt of the Ordinance. His quotation is rather a prediction then a command; and ſuppoſing it be both, yet it muſt be underſtood with the forementioned limitations.

Fourthly, In a ſtrict ſenſe, Actual receiving is not an act of worſhip, no more then preaching, conſecrating and diſtributing the Elements is. And if it be not properly an act of worſhip, then his argument falls of it ſelf: or if it be in a large ſenſe (as the other acts forementioned) yet by them its apparent that all perſons are not obliged to all acts of worſhip, ſince only Miniſters may preach, baptize, conſecrate and give the Elements, which yet in ſome reſpect are acts of worſhip.

What he adds in the ſame Paragraph about a poor ſouls doubting of his right to the Sacrament, yet reſolved to give up himſelf to Chriſt, makes little for his purpoſe:

poſe: the Queſtion is, Whether any not reſolving to give up himſelf to Chriſt, ought to receive; and whether upon his viſible refuſall to give up himſelf to Chriſt, the Miniſter is bound to give unto him the ſymbole of Chriſt?

Object.6. The Sacrament is not a converting, but a confirming Ordinance. *Ergo.*

Anſw. This indeed is one of our grand arguments againſt free admiſſion, and if it be not Cannon-proof our cauſe muſt needs be in a great deal of hazard; it concerns us therefore to make it good againſt all M.*H.* his battery.

Now for overthrow of this Argument, he pretends *that our Divines look at Baptiſme as converting, the Lords Supper as edifying*, pag.53. The former he willingly aſſents to, *&c.*

The Queſtion is not what ſome Divines hold, but what they ſhould hold. For our parts, we beleeve no Sacrament, underſtand it as received, is a means of Regeneration, but only of confirmation and edification: and ſuppoſing Baptiſme be called the Laver of Regeneration, *Titus* 3.5. which yet the place proves not; its only ſo by way of ſignification and obſignation, not by way of cauſality. In regeneration

ration and converſion the Word is writ in our hearts, but can any man either Scripturally or rationally, make the ſeal the cauſe of the writing? Is it not evident that Baptiſme doth not cauſe but preſuppoſe converſion? *Acts* 2.42. yea and profeſſion too *in adultis*, Acts 8.37. and is called by Divines the Seal of Initiation, not as it initiates us into a ſtate of ſaving grace, but into the body of the viſible Church, and as it may ſeal the truth and benefit of Regeneration to perſons converted, but not work Regeneration where it is wanting. Paſſing therefore his flouriſh of denomination *à parte eminentiori*, let us ſee how he proves the Sacrament to be converting.

His main Argument is, *Becauſe the Sacrament is a viſible Word holding forth Chriſt and the Covenant to the ſight, as the Goſpel doth to the hearing.* *And* pag.56. *The Sacrament ſhews forth Chriſts death,* 1 Cor.11.20. *Therefore as it doth ſo, it is undoubtedly converting.* *Pag.*

Doth not M. *H.* know, that at the Sacrament there is a mixture of ſeverall Ordinances, as prayer, preaching or opening the words of inſtitution, *&c.* And that thoſe may be effectuall means of converſion *Anſw*

ſion we deny not; upon which account we judge it fitting, that whoever will may be preſent at the Lords Supper as well as at Baptiſme. But the great Queſtion is, Whether actuall receiving be a converting Ordinance? And here we challenge the challenger, to give any one inſtance of a perſon converted by receiving the Lords Supper; or to make proof that the act of receiving doth convert. The Sacrament indeed is food to nouriſh, but where is it called an immortall ſeed to beget any to Chriſt?

For his gloſſe *page* 56. *There is in the Sacrament a Take for converſion, and an Eat for nouriſhment*, It is *gratis dictum*, and would make againſt the converſion of the Apoſtles who were commanded to take as well as to eat, yet I hope they were not in an unconverted condition. 2. Taking and eating do both imply and call for acts of faith, but the act of faith muſt needs preſuppoſe the habit of faith, and ſo converſion; He that ſayes, Take, eat, ſuppoſes a man hath an hand to receive and a mouth to feed on, which no uncoverted perſon hath.

Object. Why may not the command of taking Chriſt in the Sacrament be an inſtrument of

of Converſion, as well as the ſame command is in the word preached, *Acts* 16.31?

Anſw. Becauſe we have neither promiſe nor preſident of bleſſing the command of *taking* in the Sacrament, as we have of bleſſing the word preached, in order to converſion. The Word is both ſeed and food, not ſo the Sacrament, which indeed may be food or phyſick, but not a ſeed of regeneration, nor is any where ſo called in Scripture: And to attribute that to an Ordinance which God hath not put in it, or to expect that from an Ordinance which God hath not promiſed to it, is will worſhip, an humane invention, and a breach of the ſecond Commandment.

I dare appeal to M. *Humphry* his conſcience upon this account. Suppoſe an unconverted perſon comes to the Sacrament in his pride and preſumption, ſtouts it ſtill againſt Chriſt laid before him as crucified in and before the conſecration of the Elements by the Miniſters explication and exhortation, what evidence doth the Scripture give that this man ſhall be converted by that one word *Take*, uttered by the Miniſter at the delivery of the Elements? I doubt not of Gods power, but we muſt look

look to his revealed will. The Papiſts ſay, *Hoc eſt corpus meum* converts the Elements; M. *H.* ſayes *Accipite* converts the receiver: we deſire a clear proof of both before we can give credit to either. But ſuppoſe the word *Take* as a ſhort and virtual Sermon might convert, yet what thinks he of that perſon who ſtands out againſt that word alſo, can he be converted by actuall receiving? Then that rule of the Apoſtle, 1 *Cor.* 11.29. cannot be univerſally true, *He that eats unworthily eats judgement to himſelf*, &c. for he that is converted by actuall receiving doth not eat judgement but mercy. 2. Suppoſe a man ſhould be converted by that ſhort exhortation, *take*, ſince that may be done by preſence at the Sacrament without actuall receiving, how will it follow that all muſt receive becauſe ſome may be converted by the exhortation to receive; any more then that all muſt be aſſured of their ſalvation, becauſe ſome are comforted by the exhortation to aſſurance, which is not immediatly the duty, nor at all the priviledge of unconverted perſons *in ſtatu quo*.

Page 66. For further proof, *He ſuppoſes a morall unregenerate man doth his beſt to prepare himſelf*: thence he infers, *Do*

We

we think now, to ſuch a man the Ordinance is neceſſarily fruitleſſe, &c. *then God help us. Shall not his examination, prayers,* &c. *conduce more to convert him then the bare preaching of a Sermon, eſpecially conſidering the Word doth but precede and is a part of the Sacrament,* Accedit verbum ad Elementum, *&c.*

Anſw. 1. No naturall man ever doth his beſt to prepare himſelf. 2. Notwithſtanding all his preparatory acts he hath ſtill the unworthineſſe of perſon, he coming (as is ſuppoſed) unconverted to the Sacrament. 3. Therefore he comes to the feaſt without the wedding garment, and whether converſion or confuſion be the portion of ſuch a gueſt let the text judge, ſuppoſing (as M. *H.* would have it) the marriage feaſt be the Lords Supper. We believe no Ordinance is the feaſt, but rather the diſh wherein the feaſt is ſerved. 4. I wonder M. *H.* ſhould attribute more to a few dead acts of a naturall man, then to the Word preached which is the great Ordinance ſet apart for the converſion of ſouls, *Acts* 26.16,18. *Rom.* 10.14,17. as if he deſigned to advance nature and free-will above grace. 5. Becauſe he adds, *I but the Word accompanies the Sacrament,* what

followes

followes thence but that any one may be preſent to hear and ſee, but only worthy communicants are to receive? and unleſſe he can make out that actuall receiving of the Elements is a converting Ordinance, all he pleads from the antecedaneous acts will not conclude his free admiſſion, ſince the fruit of the viſible and audible word, or of Chriſts death declared may be attained by preſence at the Sacrament though a perſon do not actually receive. I would not here be miſtaken as if I pleaded for a Sacrament without receivers, which is a contradiction *in adjecto*, but I ſee no warrant in the word why the whole Congregation ſhould not ſtay at the adminiſtration of the Lords Supper (and that with much profit) as well as at the adminiſtration of Baptiſm, though all do not partake: nor can I look at their ancient *Ite, miſſa eſt*, as a divine precept, but as an humane tradition.

Actuall receiving is neither a word, nor an act of God, but meerly an act of the creature, and an outward act too, and therefore hath not a converting power in it.

For his inſtance *pag.* 57. *Of a poor humbled ſoul hoping to meet Chriſt at the Sacrament*, &c.

I anſwer: 1. If his humiliation and hope be right, he is a worthy receiver and already converted, and ſo not a fit inſtance or *medium* to prove M. *H.* his concluſion.

cluſion. If his hope and humiliation be not right, then he is in the condition of the former, and by his hypocriſie drawes further guilt upon himſelf.

2. This poor ſoul if rightly humbled, hungers after Chriſt, rouls upon him and adheres to him, which are proper acts of ſaving and juſtifying faith, though he cannot riſe up to faith of evidence; nor can any man avoid deſpair unleſſe he lean upon Chriſt or ſomewhat elſe. All which clearly prove this perſon to be converted, and that therfore the Sacrament is to him only a means of edification and comfort.

His third inſtance *pag.* 58. of the Diſciples of *Emaus*, is to as little purpoſe as the two former; unleſſe he can prove 1. That then they were in the ſtate of nature. 2. That that breaking of bread was the Sacrament; *Luk.* 24. 30. 3. That they were converted by that breaking of bread: Dictates ſo abſurd, that the very naming of them may be a ſufficient confutation.

Although a man may be converted *at*, it is not *by* the Sacrament, it is occaſionally, but not intentionally a converting Ordinance. *Rep. Pag.* 58.

Here (before I proceed any further) I muſt tell M. *H.* he frames an Objection

for us very unhandſomly. A converting Ordinance occaſionally, not intentionally, is little better then a contradiction, the very notion of an Ordinance implying divine ordination or appointment of any thing by his revealed will as a means of converſion, edification, comfort and benefit to the creature; and how this can be properly called a not intentionally converting Ordinance, is to me a paradox. Let him prove actuall receiving to be a converting Ordinance, and we ſhall not doubt but it is ſo intentionally.

To the Reply M. *H.* anſwers, *That it being granted, the matter is upon the point yeelded, partly becauſe none are expreſly forbidden to come, and partly becauſe all occaſions muſt be taken for our ſalvation.*

Anſw. 1. The cauſe is not yeelded unleſſe it be proved, that actuall receiving is a converting Ordinance, ſince the end of converſion may be attained by preſence at the Sacrament without receiving, but the danger of eating and drinking unworthily cannot be incurred without receiving, 1 *Cor.* 11.27,29. which yet hath no influence in order to converſion. By preſence much benefit may be gained without danger of unworthy receiving, by receiving

ceiving much guilt may be contracted without hopes of benefit to the unconverted.

Secondly, If receiving be a converting Ordinance, how dares M. *H.* exclude either Children, diſtracted or excommunicated perſons from it, eſpecially ſince theſe have moſt need of it, and thoſe are beſt taught by ſenſe who have not ſo free an exerciſe of reaſon? Yea why ſhould Heathen be denied the Lords Supper more then the word preached, if it be a converting Ordinance? Are not they alſo bound to uſe all means and take all occaſions of converſion, to uſe M. *H.* his own words?

But if all hath been ſaid will not take with us, M. *H.* at laſt hath found out a way, *wholly to root out this ſubtilty which he thinks the ſpirit of errour hath inſinuated into the hearts of many godly men, by three things he hath more to ſay*, &c.

Anſw. By the way obſerve this mans preſumption and cenſoriouſneſſe; 1. In charging ſo many godly perſons to be acted with a ſpirit of errour in this particular. 2. In his confident undertaking wholly to root it out by what he hath to ſay, which though mountains in his own conceit, yet when they come to be ſcan-

ned, we hope by Gods aſſiſtance to make appear they ſcarce deſerve the name of molehills; and with a ſling and ſtone of Gods making, fear not to incounter with this great and vaunting *Goliah*, who by big words bids defiance to the whole hoaſt of Gods *Iſrael*.

His firſt grand Argument *pag.* 59. is this, *That the Sacraments and all Ordinances are primarily and properly means of grace; and but in a remote ſenſe means of converſion or confirmation: for this grace we receive in the uſe of them, converts ſome and ſtrengthens others: and this grace received in the Sacrament, works in the unregenerate for their converſion.*

Anſw. Is not here prime ſtuff worthy of a *Doctor in Cathedrâ?* but to anſwer diſtinctly. I muſt firſt premiſe that here he ſpeaks not of relative but abſolute, not of externall but internall or inherent grace, for otherwiſe the Ordinances are means of juſtification and adoption as well as of holineſſe, of which laſt yet he muſt be underſtood. This premiſed, I anſwer, 1. That if the Ordinances be primarily means of grace, they muſt needs be primarily means of converſion and confirmation, ſince primary converſion is nothing

thing elſe but grace at firſt infuſed, and primary confirmation is degrees of the ſame grace ſuperadded.

For further cleering whereof, and that all the world may ſee how M. *H.* inſtead of informing would blinde and baffle the incautelous or injudicious Reader, we muſt underſtand there is a two-fold converſion; one primary, when God converts and changes the heart by creating grace therein, and ſo making it a new and ſoft heart, *Ezek.*36.26. turning the Wolf into a Lamb, *&c.* The other ſecondary, when by vertue of grace inherent, aſſiſted by grace externall, we turn our ſelves from ſin to God, *Ezek.*18.31,32. Now ſince there is no inherent grace, but its formally, and not only efficiently converting or confirming, its impoſſible initiall grace ſhould be wrought but converſion (which is a change of principles) muſt needs be wrought immediatly alſo: and its as impoſſible degrees of grace ſhould be ſuperadded, but thereby formally confirmation muſt be wrought. Is not the change from death to life greater then from a principle of life to an act of life? Now the firſt infuſion of grace is a change from death to life, and is ſolely Gods act wherein the

creature is meerly passive, 2 *Cor.*4.6. as the dark Chaos was to the light, *Gen.*1.2, 3. And this is Gods converting of us, or habituall conversion. Our converting of our selves (which is M. *Humphry* his sole conversion) is nothing but a reflecting of the beam upon the Sonne of righteousnesse, and in a manner nothing to the former work of divine conversion; this we call actuall conversion; as habituall sanctification is called ἁγιοσύνη, actuall sanctification ἁγιασμὸς. His assertion then is false, That the Ordinances are remotely means of conversion, for if the Ordinances be primarily means of converting grace, they must needs be primarily means of conversion, since grace infused is primary conversion, but grace acting is secondary conversion. The same I might say of confirmation also in proportion.

Secondly, It cannot be proved, that actuall receiving is either primarily or secondarily a means of converting grace; and therefore will certainly prejudice, but cannot benefit an unconverted person.

Thirdly, How absurd is the last clause? *This grace received in the Sacrament, works in the unregenerate for their conversion.* For 1. How is he unregenerate who hath received

ceived grace which formally regenerates him? 2. How can a man be regenerate, and yet at the ſame inſtant unconverted? yet if Mr. *Humphrey* his Doctrine be true, this will follow, ſince a man is regenerated by the habits of grace infuſed, which not only in order of nature, but alſo in order of time, may precede the acts of grace (it being not neceſſary, that grace preſent ſhould act immediately or at all times.) Now ſince Mr. *H.* his converſion is nothing but the acting of grace, and the habit of grace infuſed may in time precede the act, and there is no converſion before the act of grace, doth it not hence neceſſarily follow, that a man may be regenerated, and yet at the ſame inſtant of time unconverted, that is at the ſame time in a ſtate of nature, as unconverted, and yet in a ſtate of grace as regenerated? But how abſurd and diſſonant is this to true Divinity?

His ſecond grand Argument is drawn from a diſtinction of converſion, which he makes double, 1. *Outward from Heathenism to the profeſſion of Chriſtianity; He will not ſay the Sacrament is ſuch a converting Ordinance.* 2. *An effectuall converſion from profeſſion to the truth of grace; and*

thus the Sacrament as a viſible Word doth convert inſtrumentally as well as the Word preached, the Spirit being the principall cauſe of converſion in both Ordinances, &c. And in the cloſe of pag. 60. *he appeals to experience for the converting power of the Sacrament.* This is the ſubſtance of that Paragraph.

Anſw. Its ſooner ſaid then proved, that the Sacrament hath converted any; 2. Though it ſhould be granted, that ſome parts of it did convert, what is Mr. *H.* his cauſe the better, unleſs he prove that actuall receiving doth convert? 3. That the Sacrament ſhould convert onely to truth of grace, and yet not convert to outward profeſſion, is as abſurd, as that the Word preached ſhould convert only to outward profeſſion, and not to truth of grace. Let Mr. *H.* ſhew me one Scripture, 1. Why Heathen may not be preſent at the Sacrament as well as at the Word preached. 2. Why the viſible Word may not convert to the form, as well as to the power of godlineſs, why it ſhould do the greater and not the leſſer. We expect not dictates but proof and Argument to convince us of this new Light.

In the third place *he deſcants, though*

to little purpoſe, about the Sacraments converting not intentionally, but occaſionally, &c. To which we briefly anſwer, That whatever other parts of the Sacrament may do, yet actuall receiving converts neither occaſionally nor intentionally, and therefore unconverted perſons ought not to receive, becauſe this Sacramentall action cannot benefit but prejudice them.

Rep. Unregenerate men are dead in ſin, and bread muſt not be given to dead men, &c.

This Mr. H. *makes to be a fancy.* 2. *Oppoſes, that if any bread could recover life, that bread might be given to a dead man, and ſuch is the bread in the Sacrament, &c.* 3. *That if we may give* Aqua vitæ *to dying men, then we may give* Calix vitæ *to dead Chriſtians, &c.*

Anſw. 1. Its no wonder if ſtrong fancies metamorphize what they pleaſe into a fancy.

2. Sacramentall receiving in the Lords Supper notes a vitall act, which a dead man cannot put forth; and be the bread never ſo quickning (upon Mr. *H.* his ſuppoſition) if a dead man cannot receive it, it will not quicken him; as the beſt

Phyſick

Phyſick will not cure, if a living man will not, or cannot receive it. Taking and eating in the Sacrament note (not a paſſive, but) an active receiving, and therefore do not beget, but preſuppoſe life; which life, grant it may be wrought by other Sacramentall actions, proves only, that preſence, not participation is requiſite.

3. His *Simile* is very lame; nor doth it follow, that becauſe we may give *Aqua vitæ* to a dying man, therefore we may give *Calix vitæ* to a dead man, ſince a dying man hath life to be preſerved, not ſo a dead man.

In the cloſe of his Reply, in his third Edition he adds three pages by way of explication, *pag.* 69. which I muſt take a little pains to ſcan and ſift.

And 1. *He makes confirmation of the Covenant a primary end, confirmation of our faith a ſecuodary end of the Lords Supper.*

Anſw. I wiſh Mr. *H.* did not ſhew himſelf as little skill'd in Morality as in Logick. Let him tell me ſeriouſly (for no doubt, being Maſter of Arts, he hath ſpent ſome time at the Univerſity in Ethicks as well as in Logick) Is not the principall

principall or laſt End the primary End? and ſubordinate Ends are not they ſecondary Ends? If ſo, then the next queſtion will be, Whether the confirmation of the Covenant be not ſubordinate to the confirmation of our faith? In plain tearms, Whether Gods end in confirming the Covenant by the Sacrament as a Seal, be not to confirm the faith of the worthy Receiver? If ſo, then the confirmation of the Covenant hath the notion of a means in order to the confirmation of faith as an End. Now let Mr. *H.* himſelf judge whether confirmation of faith be not a primary End, and confirmation of the Covenant a ſecondary End, quite contrary to his former Aſſertion?

In his following words he would very fain (by compliance and ſome conceſſions) court us into his own opinion, that the Sacrament is a converting Ordinance though but eventually; *Which*, ſaies he, pag. 71. *Will ſerve to blunt the ſtrength of the Objection.*

Anſw. He muſt pardon us if we cannot grant him that, till he can bring us better ground from Scripture and reaſon then yet we can ſee. 2. Grant the previous actions of prayer, explication, and exhortation,

exhortation, may be converting (upon which we yeeld an univerſall preſence at the whole Ordinance) yet unleſs Mr. *H.* can prove, that actuall receiving doth convert, our Argument (drawn from the *non*-converting power of the Sacrament) is not blunted.

2, Whereas in the ſame Page he adds, *When I ſay its a means of converting ſome, I take it in its full adminiſtration, requiring duties before, in, and after receiving.*

An. Then belike converſion depends more upon our preparation, celebration, and after carriages, then upon the Sacrament as an Inſtrument. Here is a plain faulter; for a converting Ordinance (when God pleaſes) will convert, come the ſubject never ſo unprepared, yea with never ſo malicious an heart: And though preparation be neceſſary for all, *neceſſitate præcepti*, yet it is not neceſſary for converſion to any, *neceſſitate medii*, witneſs divers who when they came maliciouſly to catch the Miniſter, have themſelves been caught and converted.

Its more abſurd which he adds, *That the Sacrament is a means of converſion, by the help of after duty.* For beſides that, hence its apparent, this Receiver was not converted

converted at the Sacrament, and ſo did but eat and drink judgement to himſelf. Will it not by this rule follow, that even unworthy receiving it ſelf, is a means of converſion, ſince by after duty a man may be brought to a ſight of his great ſin, and thereby may be humbled and converted? May not any ſin by this Doctrine be a means of converſion, or (in Mr. *H.* his phraſe) a converting Ordinance, ſince by after carriage a man may be brought to a ſight and ſenſe of his ſin, and ſo converted? We ſay, unworthy receiving, and ſo other ſins may be occaſions, but not means of converſion. God can make an antidote of poyſon, but he is mad who upon that account will venture to drink poyſon.

In the ſame Page he adds, *Then I hold that we who are baptized into the Church, and are bred up to a generall faith (ſuch as it is) not without its fruits; and ſo have a right unto the Ordinance, coming as preparedly as We can, and bewayling our unpreparedneſs, may finde grace in the ſight of God, even to the beſtowing of a ſpeciall juſtifying faith for our inward effectuall converſion in the uſe of it. The main harveſt in this field of* Boaz *belongs to his own*

reapers

reapers, yet I would afford some gleaning for poor Ruth *the* Moabitess, *and suffer many a doubtfull, penitently inclined, yet unregenerate soul, to come up even to the sheaves, hoping my fellow labourers will not grudge at it, though I have let fall some handfulls too on purpose for them.*

Answ. Its a novell expression to say we are baptized into the Church; we reade of baptizing into Christ, but not in Scripture of baptizing into the Church; is it not as absurd, *Baptizari in Ecclesiam*, as *Credere in Ecclesiam?*

2. How many are not so much as bred up to a generall faith, but are as ignorant as the very *Indians*, that never heard of Christ?

3. What fruits have many bred up to a generall faith, unless it be open profanes, scoffing at Religion and Duties both publick and private: Shall not these (against his generall Assertion) be excluded by Mr. *Humphrey* his own present verdict?

4. What naturall man ever did his utmost to come preparedly? and therefore by Mr. *H.* his own principle held forth in this Paragraph, 1. Ought not to receive. And 2. Cannot be converted by receiving.

ving. 3. His alluſion to the caſe of *Ruth*, is 1. Abſurd. 2. Impertinent. Abſurd, in that he ſaies, *The main harveſt in this field of* Boaz *belongs to his own reapers.* This in the Letter is falſe, ſince the harveſt belonged not to the reapers, but to *Boaz* himſelf; it belonged no more to the reapers, then to the oxen or aſſes that carried it away to *Boaz* his barn, nay haply not ſo much. 2. Its impertinent, as miſapplied, he comparing unregenerate perſons to *Ruth* the *Moabiteſs*, and yet forgetting himſelf, he tells us, theſe unregenerate perſons are penitently inclined. His meaning ſeems to be, They are Heathen as unregenerate, and yet Chriſtians as Profeſſors and penitently inclined.

Anſ. Such *Ruths* we ſhall not grudge if he let ſome handfuls fall unto them. We undertake not to judge of mens hearts whether they be regenerate or not, but proceed by the rule of viſibility, and ſhall willingly admit perſons penitently inclined; but are withall ſatisfied, that perſons groſly ignorant or ſcandalous are not *in ſtatu quo* penitently inclined, and therefore by Mr. *H.* his own principles, are not to be admitted as receivers

ceivers of the Lords Supper, though they may be preſent, and that with great advantage, at the whole Ordinance.

Object.7. Judas received not the Lords Supper, &c.

To evade the force of this Objection, Mr. *H.* in two leaves takes ſome pains, though to ſmall purpoſe, to prove that *Judas* received. His ground is, *Becauſe* Judas *was preſent at the Lords Supper, and Chriſt bid all preſent to receive.* Compare *Luk.* 22.21. *Matth.*27.27. & *Mark* 14.23. where its ſaid, *They all drank* of the Sacramentall Cup.

Anſw. 1. Its the judgement of divers learned, that *Judas* did not receive. 2. Grant him preſent at the Sacrament, it follows not thence, that he did receive. 3. Chriſt bidding all to receive muſt be limited onely to *thoſe all* for whom he ſhed his blood for remiſſion of ſins, as is evident in the words that accompany the tender of the Cup Compare *Mat.*26.28. and *Luke* 22.20. But Chriſts blood was not ſhed for *Judas* for the remiſſion of ſins, *ergo*, the Sacrament was not tendered to him. 4. It ſeems probable that Chriſt excluded *Judas* in particular in thoſe words *Luke* 22.21. *But behold, the hand*

hand of him that betrayeth me, is with me on the table. As if he ſhould have ſaid, What haſt thou (who art a Traytor) to do to receive among my faithfull Diſciples? 5. Suppoſing he did receive, 1. Chriſt acted (in admitting him) as a particular Miniſter, who alone cannot exclude any. 2. Before and at receiving he told him home his ſin and danger, which I believe Mr. *H.* doth not to every *Judas* that receives at his Sacrament. *Judas* his inſtance then will not favour Mr. *H.* his free Admiſſion.

Object. 8. Unworthy Receivers are guilty of Chriſts blood, and eat their own damnation; therefore we muſt not allow free admiſſion.

To this Mr. *H.* anſwers, *That it cannot concern the admitters and joyners,* &c.

Anſw. It concerns the admitters, if any partake who are viſibly unworthy, and the joyners if they know them to be unworthy, and do not complain; the rule being, that a man muſt receive ἕτως, but not abſolutely, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28.

Whereas *p.* 68. he adds, *Every one is to examine himſelf, if he do not,* he receives his own damnation, *not ours, who do our duty,* &c. ἑαυτῷ, 1 *Corinth.* 11. 29. (not ἄλλοις.)

Answ. 1. Every man is to examine himself, and *so* to eat; but where is it said absolutely, Let every man eat? We must minde him of ἕτως, *ver.* 28. as well as he mindes us of ἀναξίως, *ver.* 29.

2. The Apostles words are not to be understood restrictively and exclusively, as if self examination excluded Church examination, or as if self prejudice excluded prejudice to my neighbour; as is evident by comparing *Rom.* 14.12. where giving an account to God, excludes not giving an account to man, for then children and servants might refuse to give any account to their parents or masters.

3. Though it be haply an improper expression to say, I eat judgement to another, yet undoubtedly another mans unworthy receiving may be charged upon me, when I have power to prevent it and do not. I think (as perfect as Mr. *H.* is) both himself and the best of Gods people had need pray every day, Lord forgive me my other mens sins; especially State and Church Officers.

4. Its as absurd in reason and Divinity, by an affirmative to exclude a negative, as it is by a negative to exclude an affirmative: to say, I must examine my

my ſelf, therefore another muſt not examine me; or to ſay, Another muſt examine me, therefore I muſt not examine my ſelf: or to ſay, I eat judgement to my ſelf, therefore not to another, as to ſay, I eat judgement to another, therefore not to my ſelf. Moſt ſins and duties are reciprocall; and as guilt, ſo duty is uſually relative as well as perſonall.

Rep. But you will ſay, *If a man drink poyſon, ſhall not I be guilty of his blood, unleſs I hinder him*, &c.

To this Mr. *H.* anſwers, 1. *Not, unleſs I have a* quum poſſum. 2. *He wonders any ſhould compare the Sacrament to a cup of poyſon, ſeeing it is in its own nature a cup of bleſſing.* 3. *That it is more then we can know or ought to judge, that it proves death to any.* 4. *That as the Word may be preached to all (though often it prove the ſavour of death) ſo the Sacrament may be adminiſtred unto all, leaving the iſſue to God, &c.* This for the admitters part, *pag.* 68. 70.

Anſw. 1. His *quum poſſit* muſt be underſtood either of a naturall or a morall ability. I believe that whoever hath a naturall, hath at the ſame time a morall ability to hinder his brother from murdering himſelf by poyſon. In plain Engliſh,

liſh, whoever can, ought to hinder his brother from drinking of poyſon. *Cains* Religion may be indeed, *Am I my brothers keeper?* but Chriſts Religion is, *He that ſaves not life, deſtroyes it.* I muſt preſerve my neighbours life by all lawfull means; but undoubtedly its a lawfull means by violence to hinder my neighbour from ſelf murder.

2. His wonder deſerves to be wondered at. If one mans corporall food be another mans poyſon (though in it ſelf wholſome, as Cheeſe, &c.) why may not one mans ſpirituall food be another mans poyſon? Nay, the ſame food is at one time good nouriſhment, at another time poyſon to the ſame man, namely fleſh, &c. in a ſtrong feaver. The ſame Word is a ſavour of life and a ſavour of death, and why not the ſame Sacrament, and what is a deadly ſavour but poyſon? Chriſt is a precious corner ſtone to ſome, a ſtone of ſtumbling to others; and if Chriſt perſonall be ſo, why not Chriſt Sacramentall?

3. If I may know and judge when the Word is poyſon to any, why not as well, yea better, when the Sacrament is poyſon? I may know the Word is ſo by its effects

effects or conſequents: I may know the Sacrament is ſo, both by its cauſes and effects; as if a groſly ignorant or profane perſon come to receive, and if after receiving I ſee a man as bad or worſe then formerly.

4. As the Word may be preached before all, ſo the Sacrament may be adminiſtred before all, but as the Word is not applied by all, nor divers parts of it applicable to all, ſo neither ought the Sacrament to be applied to all by actuall receiving. If any man will give his neighbour poyſon, and leave the iſſue to God, the Magiſtrate may more juſtly give him an halter, and leave the iſſue to God.

Next Mr. *H.* proceeds *to the Receivers part*, and tels us, pag. 70. *That a double duty is required of him,* 1. *A principall, Do this.* 2. *An acceſſory, Let a man examine himſelf. We are bound to come. and to come worthily. If a man fails in the one, and is not ſufficiently prepared, I dare not ſay that he muſt keep (I am ſure it will not excuſe him) from the other, &c.*

Anſw. 1. Let the Reader note how abſurdly Mr. *H.* makes *receiving* to be the principall duty, and actuall worthineſs but acceſſory. What carnall Divinity

is this, to make the matter and carkaſs of a duty the principall, and the ſpirit of a duty acceſſory; the form of godlineſs the principall, and the power of godlineſs the acceſſory? Is not this principall Divinity, and very pleaſing to ſome of Mr. *H.* his principall Receivers?

2. His doubtfull expreſſion about coming, though unprepared, evidences his hesitancy about that particular, and not without juſt cauſe. True, he that is bound to come, is bound to come worthily; but not, *contra*, he that is bound to come worthily, is bound to come abſolutely, no more then he that was bound to come circumciſed and pure to the Paſſeover, was bound to come abſolutely. Every *Jew* was bound to be circumciſed, pure, and ſo to come to the Paſſeover; but had he neglected Circumciſion and Purification, he was not to eat the Paſſeover at that time. In like manner, every Chriſtian is bound to be, 1. Habituallly worthy. 2. Actually worthy. 3. And *ſo* to receive, 1 *Cor.* 11.28. yet is not bound to receive, but rather to abſtain if he want either of the former. The Apoſtle doth not ſay, Let a man eat abſolutely; but *ſo let him eat.*

3. Sinfull

3. Sinfull unpreparedneſs will not excuſe a man from guilt, but unpreparedneſs either ſinfull or lawfull, will excuſe him from receiving. A negative unpreparedneſs will excuſe children and thoſe who have urgent and juſt occaſions that hinder them from receiving; not ſo privative unpreparedneſs. He that travelled of purpoſe to avoid the Paſſeover, ſinned; not ſo he who had juſt and neceſſary occaſions to travell, *Numb.*9.10,13. But be unpreparedneſs negative or privative, that man at preſent ought not to receive, though he ſin in bringing a ſinfull neceſſity of abſtinence upon himſelf. None are threatned ſimply for not receiving, but all are threatned in caſe they receive unworthily.

For further explication and confirmation, Mr. *H.* propounds three Quæries.

1 Qu. *Whether the very eating and drinking of an unworthy Receiver be damnation?* He means, *Whether it deſerve damnation? He anſwers, by diſtinguiſhing between the act of receiving, which is good, and the unworthineſs, which makes the ſin onely; and concludes, That his abſtinence from, is a greater ſin then his unworthy receiving of the Sacrament,* &c. pag. 71.

Answ. 1. Receiving is alwaies a sin in him that is unworthy, 1. Because he cannot but receive unworthily, but that act which cannot be abstracted from sinfull pravity in dominion, is necessarily sin. 2. Because he is threatned, but God threatens for nothing but sin. Eating is not in it self a sin, yet for a common person to eat the sin-offering, was a sin: So receiving simply is no sin, but an unworthy person cannot receive without sin. There is no sinfull act in the world, but notionally you may abstract sinfulness from it, but really you cannot when it comes to be acted; no more can you from an unworthy persons receiving, which is sinfull, 1. In the manner. 2. As prohibited to such a person *in statu quo*. He is bound indeed to get worthiness, and then to receive: but he is not bound to receive till he be Evangelically worthy. As a naturall man ought first to get grace and then assurance, but not to study assurance without grace.

2. Abstinence from the Sacrament arises out of contempt, or from a grounded evidence and consciousness of Evangelicall unworthiness. The former is more sinfull then bare receiving; the latter is warran-

warrantable, yea commendable, 1. If it humble the man, though but legally, 2. If it put him upon care and diligence to prepare for the next Sacrament.

2 Qu. pag. 72. *His ſecond Quære is, Whether receiving the Sacrament unworthily is otherwiſe damnable then praying and hearing unworthily?*

Anſw. It is, and that 1. Becauſe praying and hearing are univerſall duties, I mean for all ſorts, be they children, diſtracted, or excommunicated, or otherwiſe unworthy, ſo is not receiving in Mr. *H.* his own judgement. 2. Becauſe praying and hearing are means of converſion, ſo is not actuall receiving. His ſuperſtructure upon the coutrary ſuppoſition I omit, ſince that will tumble down of it ſelf, the foundation failing.

3 *Qu.* His third Quære, pag. 74. is, *Whether an unregenerate man conceiving himſelf not worthy, muſt never come to the Sacrament for fear of eating his damnation?* The ſumme of his Anſwer is, *That upon the ſame ground he muſt alſo abſtain from hearing, ſince he cannot but hear ſinfully, and ſo provoke God,* &c.

Anſw. 1. Not ſo, unleſs it can be proved the Sacrament is a converting Ordinance. 2. Grant

2. Grant some parts or acts at the Sacrament may convert, this proves onely that all may and ought to be present, to see and hear Christ crucified; but it makes nothing for actuall receiving, which ever makes an unworthy person eat damnation, and therefore doth not convert him. He that hears unworthily may be converted, not so he that receives unworthily, at that time.

3. In the close of this Quære, *He can put no medium between receiving unworthily, and an open refusing to receive.* I shall therefore help him at a dead lift, and intreat so much charity of him, as to believe that all abstainers are not open refusers and tramplers upon the blood of Christ, no more then he who forbore the Passeover being in a journey, or unclean was. Yea some godly persons, but out of fear of unworthiness, dare not sometimes come; will he say these trample upon Christs blood? Why may not legall conviction fright a naturall man, as well as a godly man from receiving? Sense of unworthiness may prevail upon a *Demas* as well as upon a *Nathanael*, and make him affraid of the signes as well as of the thing signified, yet neither of them at that

that time like ſwine trample upon the blood of the Covenant, but think it infinitely too good for them.

In his new Edition, *pag.* 85. he inſerts three pages more for amplification of the eighth Objection. He takes upon him to anſwer a queſtion of his own propounding. His Queſtion is miſty, and his Anſwer is in part falſe. The ſumme of his Anſwer is, *The alteration is made onely in us, the ſeal is the ſame, and what is ſealed is the ſame.*

Anſw. Is not here an apparent falſity, as to the latter branch of the Anſwer, unleſs he will make ſalvation and damnation to be one and the ſame thing? If ſalvation be ſealed to the worthy, damnation to the unworthy Receivers, then ſurely though the ſeal be the ſame, yet what is ſealed is not the ſame thing. As (to uſe his own ſimilitude) though the Sun be the ſame, yet the ſunſhine and the ſhadow, or light and darkneſs are not the ſame, but privative contraries. But no wonder if looſe principles produce ſuch looſe concluſions.

Rep. *But ſuppoſe a poor ſoul doubts of his faith, does this bring any relief to him uncertain of the Condition?*

Anſw.

Answ. *Me thinks it doth; the condition of the Covenant may be considered as in* esse, *already wrought in us, or in* fieri, *as to be done or performed of us. The Receiver seals not necessarily to the condition in* esse, *but in* fieri *obliging himself for the future to believe and obey*, &c.

Answ. 1. True, the Sacrament may bring relief to a doubting soul, who hath indeed truth of grace, but doubts of it. But what relief can it bring to one that doubts groundedly, and hath no grace at all? 1. It cannot convert him (understand me still of actuall receiving) as hath been formerly shewed. 2. It cannot confirm him, unless it be in sin, by sealing judgement to him. For can he be confirmed in grace who hath no grace at all?

2. Where he saies, The Receiver seals not necessarily to the condition *in esse*, but *in fieri*, I answer, He seals as necessarily (in point of duty) to the condition *in esse* or *de præsenti*, as *in fieri* or *de futuro*, and that man who ingages not to believe at present, plaies the hypocrite in ingaging to believe hereafter. It is not with elicit as with imperate acts; in the former, he that truly wills them, doth in part perform them, whence Divines make

make a true desire of faith one degree of faith, and he that in truth desires and resolves to beleeve hereafter, may as well act that resolution now, since faith it self as well as the resolution of faith is an act of the will. And this M. *H.* would speak in those words, *Page* 86. *If he resolve now for the time to come without procrastination to walk according to the Covenant.* Is not faith the first step of this walk? He that resolves in truth to beleeve, cannot but desire to beleeve, and the true desire of faith, is both Scripturally and by the consent of Divines one degree of faith.

Thirdly, By the very act of receiving, he seals to faith *in esse* or *de praesenti* in point of profession; the very language of his receiving the Elements is, I receive Christ signified and offered to me in particular by them; and therefore he that receives the Elements and doth not act faith at the same instant, he playes the hypocrite wofully, mocks God and Christ, and as the mockers of Christ were guilty of his death, so is every unworthy receiver.

Pag. 86. He proceeds. *The faith therefore that is absolutely requisite to a beleever is not assurance, but consists, I take it, of these two things only.* 1. *An historicall assent to*

the Gospel, &c. 2. *A resolution to submit to the Government of Christ*, &c. *Let a man then but beleeve his Creed, and resolve to go on in no known sin, that is the main*, &c. pag. 87.

Answ. 1. I easily grant assurance is not absolutely requisite as a means, but only in point of duty (namely that every one is bound to labour after it,) and in order unto our *benè esse* or comfort. 2. Against every Sacrament a Christian is bound in an especiall manner by soul-searching examination, to make out his evidence; and if he have truth of grace and take pains to search, he will by Gods grace finde so much truth in himself, as may bring him to some assent about his good estate, though usually this assent be much assaulted and weakned with doubting, for removing whereof the Sacrament is an especiall help. But 3. Whereas M. *H.* professeth to know no other kindes or ingredients of saving or justifying faith, but only an historicall assent and a good purpose or resolution. 1. I must tell him he is very defective on the one hand as omitting the speciall act of justifying faith, namely adherence or leaning upon Christ for justification and salvation, which is an act of the will

will, not of the underſtanding; nor will his hiſtoricall faith for kinde go beyond the faith of hypocrites, yea of devils, *Iam.* 2. 19. and will aggravate a mans damnation if the faith of adherence follow not upon it. 2. I muſt alſo tell him he is as exceſſive on the other in miſtaking a good reſolution for a conſtitutive part of faith, which is either an antecedent or a conſequent and effect of faith, antecedent if it be a Legall, conſequent if an evangelicall reſolution. I wiſh M. *H.* would ſtudy fundamentalls better, before he come to be ſo critticall about ſuperſtructures.

By his following diſcourſe *pag.* 89. its apparent he ſpeaks very confuſedly about the ſpirituall eſtate of a Chriſtian. For 1. He ſuppoſeth a man hath not ſaving grace, and yet that at the ſame time he is willing to accept of Chriſt, to leave ſin and yeeld to Chriſts termes, all which are moſt precious ſaving graces. Afterwards he compares theſe graces to a little gold mixed with much droſſe in a lump of Ore, yet at laſt concludes God can make grace of theſe leaſt beginnings, as if at preſent they were not grace till God does as it were tranſubſtantiate them and turn our water into wine. By all which its apparent the

man

man doth not *sibi constare*, and no wonder then if he bring his Reader into a labyrinth.

Object. 9. Pag. 76. The Ordinance is polluted if all be admitted. The summe of his Answer is, *That the Ordinance is defiled only to the unworthy receiver, not to the admitters or joyners.*

Answ. Though we place no great confidence in this Argument, nor believe the presence or actuall receiving of a wicked person doth simply defile either the Sacrament or the communicants (as had an unclean man eaten of the Passeover, supposing he neither touched any clean person, nor any part of the Passeover but that he ate, that Ordinance had been Levitically polluted only to himself) yet connivance both in the admitters and joyners contracts morall pollution, as he that suffers another to sin (where he may and ought to hinder him, or at least do his endeavour in order thereunto) is partaker of his sin, *Lev.* 19. 17. 1 *Tim.* 5. 22.

His application of Mark. 7. 15. *and of* Peters *vision to the Sacrament*, is ridiculous, *pag.* 77. For do we hold that any either person or meat is Levitically unclean? *Contra*, dares he deny that any person, yea any meat may be morally unclean, namely

y as defiled with ſin or occaſions of ſin, *Tit.* 1. 15. That which enters into the mouth defiles not a man Levitically, but morally it may defile him, and that either by his intemperance or irreligious receiving of it, as eating the forbidden fruit defiled our firſt parents; and he who when he may hinders not theſe ſins, is himſelf defiled by ſinfull toleration.

We believe, as well as himſelf, *pag.* 79. *That the unworthineſſe of another ſhould not make the true beleever ſeparate from the Sacrament.* Yet if I know another groſly ignorant or prophane, and do not either endeavour to reform or diſcover him, his unworthy receiving ſhall be ſet upon my ſcore alone, without any prejudice to the other communicants.

If it be a priviledge of the Goſpel to have free Ordinances, and to account no man unclean in the uſe of them, ib. How dares M. *H. ſet a ſpirituall rayl* (as he calls it) *about the communion Table, and thereby refine and ſpiritualize old ſuperſtition* (to uſe his own termes,) by keeping from the Sacrament Children and diſtracted perſons, who have a better right to it then many prophane ones that his charity can admit, and yet in one breath accuſe

and condemn us for doing the like to that he allowes in himſelf? Shall perſons negatively unworthy be ſuſpended, and perſons privatively, yea poſitively unworthy be admitted? Let him take heed there be not ſomething of the Phariſee and hypocrite in his own heart (to apply his own counſell to himſelf,) 1. In cenſuring his brethren, 2. In doing the ſame thing for which he cenſures them.

*Pag.*79. But are we not faulty and partake of other mens ſins, if we do not our beſt to have the leaven purged out? and therefore we may not ſay, *Am I my brothers keeper?* Look they to it.

To this M. *H.* anſwers, 1. By way of conceſſion, *and that we muſt tell the Church too, ſuppoſing it is in a capacity to hear us.* 2. By way of refutation in the ſame page: *But I hope it will not follow that in the mean time we muſt not receive the Sacrament*, &c. *It is a plain fallacy* (à dicto ſimpliciter ad dictum ſecundum quid) *to think our coming to the Sacrament with a wicked man is ſin it ſelf, or makes it the ſin, or us more guilty of the ſin, becauſe we ought to have admoniſhed them, and laboured their excommunication. Shall omiſſion of one duty excuſe from another? Becauſe the leaven is not purged out,*

*out, muſt there be no lump. This was, I may humbly ſay, a too overly ſurpriſe of godly M.*Burroughs.

*Anſw.*1. Would one think that M.*H.* at the ſame inſtant would be guilty of that fallacy wherewith he charges us, and with the cut-purſe cry *ſtop thief*, that himſelf might the better eſcape in the croud? Do either our principles or profeſſion cry down the Sacrament abſolutely becauſe we are againſt mixed Sacraments? Or are we againſt all mixed Sacraments, becauſe we are againſt the mixed receiving of perſons viſibly unworthy with perſons viſibly worthy? Or do we teach that its ſimply a ſin in one viſibly worthy to receive with one or divers perſons viſibly unworthy?

Wherein then do we and M.*H.* differ?

*Anſw.*1. In that he thinks its the duty of all Church-members to receive, be they in what ſtate they will, never ſo ignorant, wicked and abominable, yea and that viſibly too, excepting only Children, diſtracted and excommunicated perſons. 2. In that he thinks it the Churches duty to admit all the forementioned perſons, waving only the exception.

Contra, We hold that no perſon really unworthy ought to receive. 2. That no

perſon viſibly unworthy ought to be admitted, where there is a juridicall power in the Church to ſuſpend them; which power is *de facto* in the Presbyterian Churches, but lies not in any one Miniſter, or in the Congregation it ſelf, but in the Presbytery of each Congregation, and that either ſolitary or combined. The Elderſhip then ſins not in admitting perſons really unworthy, provided they have evidence of their viſible worthineſſe: Particular perſons ſin not in communicating with perſons viſibly unworthy, but only in conniving at their viſible unworthineſſe, by neglecting either to admoniſh and reprove them, & (if that will not do in order to their reformation) by neglecting to complain to the Elderſhip of them, that by the Churches dealing with them they may either be reformed or ſuſpended, and (in caſe that will not do, and need ſo require) excommunicated. Let the Reader then take notice how guilty M. *H.* is of his own fallacy, in making the Reader beleeve we are againſt all Sacraments, or againſt all mixed Sacraments, becauſe we judge that perſons really unworthy ought not *in ſtatu quo* to receive, and perſons viſibly unworthy ſhould not by the Church be admitted to receive. Second-

Secondly, Though omiſſion of one duty do not properly excuſe, yet it may make one uncapable of another, as a perſon impure neglecting to purifie himſelf, was at preſent uncapable of the Paſſeover, and by proportion a perſon either unable or neglecting to prepare himſelf, is uncapable at preſent of the Lords Supper. As for M. *Burroughs* ſurpriſe about this particular, I dare not undertake either to charge or vindicate him, till M. *H.* produce him ſpeaking for himſelf. *Qui ſtatuit aliquid parte inauditâ alterâ, æquum licèt ſtatuerit, haud æquus fuerit.*

Are not all ignorant and ſcandalous perſons, ſwine and doggs, to be rejected and kept from the pearls and holy things of the Sacrament? *Rep.* 2.

M. *H.* in his Anſwer *queſtions the termes of Doggs and ſwine as too harſh in the generall, and thinks unfitneſſe is not a juſt ground of excluſion, and that men are not to be dealt withall as Doggs till juridically cenſured. That ſcandalous perſons are firſt to be admoniſhed duely, and then (if obſtinate) excommunicated, and that not meerly from the Sacrament, but from Chriſtian communion in generall: yet withall he ſeems doubtfull about the degrees of excommunication, and*

leaves much to the Churches wiſdom, &c. *p.* 80, to 82.

Anſw. 1. Wading the harſh expreſſions of Doggs and Swine, though warrantable enough by Scripture; its then enough for us that ignorant and ſcandalous perſons are unfit for the Sacrament, and if M. *H.* exclude Children, *&c.* becauſe unfit, why may not we exclude both ignorant and ſcandalous perſons upon the ſame account, ſince the one cannot, the other will not examine themſelves; or if after a ſort they examine, yet cannot approve themſelves, which is both the ſenſe of the word and the end of examination; but upon due ſearch will finde the quite contrary, both being under the power of unbelief, or wanting the worthineſſe of preparation, though the laſt may poſſibly have the worthineſſe of perſon.

δοκιμαζέτω.

Secondly, Neither ignorant nor ſcandalous perſons are juridically ſuſpended before admonition, and evidence given of their obſtinacy.

Thirdly, While he pleads for excommunication, he cannot be againſt ſuſpenſion which is an inferiour degree thereof.

Fourthly, That excommunication excludes from all Ordinances, is *gratis dictum*

ctum as hath been before noted.

The laſt Objection is from thoſe ſeverall Texts that are alledged for a ſeparation from wicked perſons, *pag.* 82. *Obj.* 10.

Here M. H. grants we muſt ſeparate from wicked men in their ſins and in regard of common familiarity: but denies that any Scripture commands our ſeparation from them in the Sacrament, unleſſe in caſe of excommunication, &c.

Anſw. 1. Suſpenſion being a part of excommunication, in granting ſeparation in caſe of excommunication, he yeelds the cauſe.

Secondly, That Scripture which forbids us to eat with wicked perſons, forbids us to receive with them, 1 *Cor.* 5. 11. unleſſe the Sacrament can be received without eating: nor is it enough to ſay that place ſpeaks only of civil and private eating, ſince eating of the Sacrament is a ſigne of familiarity as well as eating at our own Tables; and where I can without ſin avoid it, I may no more eat Sacramentally then civilly with a ſcandalous perſon. This Church Governours may prevent by diſcipline, and private Chriſtians by information, by which if they cannot keep away ſcandalous ſinners, theſe laſt may comfort

themſelves in that they have diſcharged their duty, but ought not to run away from Chriſt and his Ordinance becauſe of the preſence or partaking of wicked men which they cannot hinder. His inſtance of conjugall ſociety will not help him, there being an expreſſe commandment for that in Scripture, 1 *Cor.*7.13,14. not ſo for mixed communion at the Sacrament with perſons viſibly unworthy, if it lye in my power to prevent it: And though I ſin not ſimply in receiving with them, to which private Chriſtians may ſometimes be neceſſitated; yet I ſin if I do not my endeavour to prevent their receiving who are viſibly unworthy and will not be reformed by admonition.

And this may ſerve by way of anſwer to his Reply, *pag.*85. whereby he amplifies the Objection: And whereas he adds, *Now it is one thing to eat at home (an indifferent action) where I am left to my own arbitration; and another to eat at the Sacrament, which I am bound unto as a piece of Gods ſervice.*

I anſwer 1. That as eating at the Sacrament is a duty, ſo naturall eating is a duty, which cannot be neglected without guilt of ſelf-murther. 2. As when I can I ought

ought to avoid eating at my own houſe with a ſcandalous perſon, ſo when I can (without ſin) I ought to avoid eating at the Sacrament with a ſcandalous perſon. 3. As I ought not to avoid eating with a ſcandalous perſon to endanger my life or health, ſo I ought not with the hazard of my ſpirituall life and health to avoid Sacramentall eating with a ſcandalous perſon. 4. As when a ſcandalous perſon will obtrude himſelf to my table, I ought by all lawfull means to exclude him, ſo when the ſame perſon will obtrude himſelf upon Gods table, I ought by the uſe of all lawfull means to keep him off, by which if I cannot prevail, I may without guilt eat with him both at my own table and at the Lords table; and the fault ſhall lye upon him who had power to exclude him but would not.

That an excommunicated perſon is to be excluded in generall from all Chriſtian communion, as M. *H.* would have it, *pag.* 85. is 1. Falſe doctrine, 2. Bloudy and cruel doctrine, there being nothing in Scripture to warrant it, and much in the rule of charity againſt it: grant an excommunicated perſon is diſmembred and caſt out of the Church, and that he is to be as an Heathen

then and a Publican, you cannot deny him the liberties of one without, or of an Heathen and a Publican; but a Publican might come to the Temple to pray, *Luk.* 18.10. and an Heathen might come to the Church to hear, 1 *Cor.*14.24. Further, ſince excommunication it ſelf is medicinall, why ſhould it not be backt with publike and private exhortations, 1 *Cor.* 5.5. and 2 *Cor.*2.6. and 2 *Theſ.*3.6,14,15. Can it be imagined that his baniſhment from, will do him more good then his preſence at publike Ordinances? And this is the more ſtrong againſt M.*H.* who *pag.* 16. applies 2 *Theſ.*3.6,14. to the caſe of excommunication; and if perſons excommunicated muſt be admoniſhed as Brethren, why ſhould they be debarred of preſence at the Word preached, one great part whereof is admonition, eſpecially of the unruly, 1 *Theſ.*5.14. *Acts* 20.31. *Col.*1. 28. And certainly if admonition in generall be an Ordinance, yet applicable to perſons excommunicated, is it not then as clear as the Sunne, that excommunication doth not barre a perſon from all communion or from all Ordinances? the contrary to which notwithſtanding is one of M.*H.* his new Lights, *p.*85.

But

But why ſhould I ſhun an excommunicated perſon more in civil then in ſacred ſociety? Compare 1 *Cor.*5.11. and 2 *Theſ.* 3.13,14.

*Anſw.*1. Becauſe in moſt parts of ſacred ſociety there is not that mutuall familiarity which is ſo great a teſtimony of perſonall reſpect; nay perſons may often meet at Ordinances, and yet not ſo much as know one the other. 2. There is farre more neceſſity of ſacred then of civill ſociety, whether in way of duty or of means. Excommunication excuſeth not from duty, though it make a perſon uncapable of ſome priviledges; nor can anothersexcommunication excommunicate me either from duty or priviledge. Gods children muſt preſent themſelves before God though Satan himſelf come in among them, *Iob* 1.6. and 2.1.

As for thoſe places, *Ier.*15.19. and 1 *Tim.*5.22. Though they reach not the caſe of the Sacrament immediatly and in termes, yet they come home to it in a direct and naturall conſequence, ſince it concerns Miniſters to ſeparate the precious from the vile practically as well as doctrinally, in the Sacrament as well as in other Ordinances: And certainly, they who

who have power to excommunicate from all Ordinances (as Mr. *H.* teaches) have much more power to excommunicate from ſome: and if partiall or graduall Excommunication be an offence, ſure its an errour on the right hand; better offend in too much lenity then ſeverity. They who have power to deprive of all priviledges, have power to deprive of ſome, and he that may caſt a perſon out of the Church, may turn him out of the Chancell, as Mr. *Humphrey* elſewhere phraſes it.

From arguing he falls to wiſhing, *p.* 86. Let us ſee whether he be better skill'd in the Optative then in the Indicative Mood.

1. *His firſt wiſh is for a Government eſtabliſhed in the Church, the neereſt in Chriſtian prudence to the Word of God.*

An. Sir, Your deſire is granted in ſome parts of the Nation; and had it not been in a great meaſure for the negligence of too many Miniſters, and refractorineſs of moſt people, the Government you wiſh for, might long ere this have been ſettled all the Nation over.

2. His ſecond wiſh is, *That the duty of fraternall correption, inſpection, and admonition,*

nition, were better known and practiſed amongſt us.

Anſw. I can heartily ſay *Amen* to this wiſh alſo: and hope he will not be troubled that this wiſh is in part granted alſo; and in particular, that himſelf is in this diſcourſe made an object of fraternall correption. He that values admonition, is in a fair way to be mended by admonition.

3. His third wiſh is, *That men would look more into their own conſciences, and leave the judging of others ſpirits, hearts, and reynes, alone to the judgement ſeat of Chriſt.*

Anſ. An excellent wiſh; and had it been as well practiſed as wiſhed by Mr. *H.* he would not have been ſo harſh a cenſurer of his brethren, as this Plea for free admiſſion proves him.

4. His fourth wiſh is, *That though there may be ſome judging by the fruits, That wiſe and religious men would be more cautious of countenancing theſe ſeparations in the viſible Church; ſeeing upon the ſame ground that you go to gather a Church out of his mixt Congregation, another will gather a ſeparation out of your Church, and ſo in infinitum,* &c.

This as to the Argumentative part hath been anſweredformerly.

Anſw.

Anſw. I ſee a good heart is better then a wiſe head. Could we wiſh better, and diſpute leſs, how ſoon ſhould we cloſe in a good agreement? How happy had it been for *England*, if godly perſons had not countenanced ſeparation? But whether Mr. *H.* his Doctrine or our practice have occaſioned it, let the world judge. Had not ſinfull mixtures brought us to a Chaos, this ſpirit of ſeparation had not probably been hatcht in the hearts of Gods *Nazarites*. A prudent and pious ſeparation had prevented theſe fooliſh and ſinfull ſeparations. The more Mr. *H.* and others turn Church-levellers, and lay all common, the more carefull had we need be of our propriety and incloſures. Weeds may be tolerated in a Wilderneſs or Common, but are intolerable in Chriſts incloſed Garden, *Cant.* 4.12. at leaſt weeds in this Garden cannot expect all the priviledges of good herbs. How juſtly may he at laſt be lookt at as a weed by our great Husbandman, who contrary to rule and office will cheriſh weeds in Paradiſe, where he is ſet by God to till it, and to keep it.

I have done with Mr. *Humphrey*, But muſt indeavour to ſatisfie one ſcruple before

fore I ſhake hands with my Reader.

Object. Do you think all are ignorant or ſcandalous, who refuſe triall before the Elderſhip? If not, how can you deny them the Sacrament?

Anſw. God forbid. Yet firſt, obſtinate Refuſers give too much occaſion of ſuſpition in one of the former kinds.

2. Whatever any may pretend againſt the Government, what is that to the giving an account of their faith or hope to any ſhall ask it, 1 *Pet.*3.15. eſpecially upon juſt grounds.

3. Do not they ſuſpend themſelves, who will keep from the Sacrament rather then ſubmit to a duty ſo eaſie, righteous, edifying, and honourable?

4. Whatever may be done by way of extraordinary diſpenſation (where there is very good evidence of ſufficient knowledge and true piety) yet ſuch conſider not what a gap they open to ſhake, if not break, the whole frame of Government. Who will not pretend conſcience to ſcape triall when ſuch ill preſidents ſhall ſtand upon record for rules? And whether ſome few truly godly perſons or the whole Church ſhould ſuffer, I leave it

to

to their judgement who underſtand how much the *whole* is to be preferred before divers parts. Let us not ſtudy to pleaſe our ſelves, but ſeek thoſe things which tend to peace and edifying. Yet if any man ſeem to be contentious, we have no ſuch cuſtome, neither the Churches of God, 1 *Cor.* 11.16.

Deo gloria, Eccleſiæ pax & Reformatio.

FINIS.

E2148524

